

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1876.

The Week.

THE President's South Carolina proclamation has called out a good deal of bitter denunciation from the Democrats. Their argument on the subject is that, as the use of troops is made to rest upon the clause in the Constitution authorizing the national Government to "protect" any State against "domestic violence," on application of the Legislature "or of the Executive (when the Legislature cannot be convened)," apart from the question whether anything like what is called "domestic violence" does or not exist in South Carolina, the case contemplated by the Constitution is one in which the *State government* is seriously imperilled. In such a case it is obviously proper that if neither branch of it can enforce the law the United States should interfere. But Governor Chamberlain has made no effort to enforce the law, and he might perfectly well have called together the Legislature. On the other hand, who is to be the judge in such a matter? If the governor of a State solemnly protests that he cannot convene the Legislature (there may be a great many reasons for his inability to do so), and he convinces the President of this fact, as well as of the existence of "domestic violence," it may fairly be said that it is a matter of discretion whether troops shall be sent or not. Whether this view is sound or not, there is certainly no show of resistance in South Carolina to the United States. The troops already in the State before the proclamation was issued had been received with entire good-will. The campaign orators have talked themselves into such a fury over the "rebel spirit," and "outrages," and the "Confederate House," that they almost believe there is going to be another war; but in this they are mistaken. The Southerners may intimidate the negro, but the submissive spirit they shew the moment they see a file of soldiers is the best proof we could have that military interference at the South must soon come to an end.

The only legislation on this subject that we know of is contained in Sec. 5,297 of the Revised Statutes, which provides that "in case of an insurrection in any State against the government thereof, it shall be lawful for the President, on application of the Legislature of such State, or of the Executive when the Legislature cannot be convened, to call forth such number of the militia of any other State or States which may be applied for as he deems sufficient to suppress such insurrection; or, on like application, to employ for the same purposes such part of the land or naval forces as he deems necessary." This covers only "insurrection," and we suppose the word is to be taken as a synonym of the "domestic violence" coupled with it in the Constitution. Sec. 5,299 does, to be sure, provide that the President may employ the militia or the regular forces, or take such "other means as he may deem necessary," in a number of cases of "insurrection," "domestic violence," "unlawful combinations," or "conspiracies," the statute itself making these acts a denial of the "equal protection of the laws" under the Fourteenth Amendment. But the proclamation does not refer to this provision, and the words "insurrection and domestic violence" were probably used because both occur in the Constitution, and on the supposition that the statute covers both.

The Republicans have been for some time devoting themselves industriously to creating an impression that one of the great dangers from the accession of the Democrats to power would be the payment of the "Southern claims"—*i.e.*, the rebel debt, claims for losses of slaves, and claims for loss or damage incurred by rebels arising out of the war. Mr. Hewitt has now published a letter from Mr. Tilden fully disposing of these charges. He says that the first two classes

of claims are provided against by the Fourteenth Amendment which has been "repeatedly approved and agreed to" by Southern Democratic conventions, and formally adopted as a part of the St. Louis platform, and that his own position on this subject has been previously declared on many occasions. The third class of claims, whether covered or not by the Fourteenth Amendment, he looks upon in the same way, and declares that, should he be elected President, so far as depends on him "no rebel debt will be assumed or paid," "no claim for the loss or emancipation of any slave will be allowed," and "no claim for any loss or damage incurred by disloyal persons arising from the late war, whether covered by the Fourteenth Amendment or not, will be recognized or paid." Further than this, "the cotton tax will not be refunded," but Mr. Tilden says he will deem it his duty to "veto every bill" looking to the payment of such claims. He then goes on to state that in his opinion the real danger to the Treasury is not from the rebel but from the "loyal" Southern claims—*i.e.*, claims arising out of acts caused by the operations of war. Such claims are, he says, "disowned by the public law of civilized nations," condemned by decisions of the Supreme Court, and have no standing except by specific acts of Congress. They are often tainted with fraud, and should always be "scrutinized with jealous care."

The outcry raised in the newspapers at the supposed determination of Boss Kelly to put up Mr. Augustus Schell for Mayor has apparently induced the Boss to relent, and he has substituted Mr. Smith Ely, jr., in Mr. Schell's place. This is a much better nomination. Mr. Ely is a merchant of unblemished character, who has the advantage of a great deal of political experience of a trying kind. He was in the old Board of Supervisors, voted against all of Tweed's fraudulent schemes, and, when he became convinced of Tweed's villainy, dropped his acquaintance and refused to speak to him. This is spoken of as much in Mr. Ely's favor, and indeed it is the only instance that we know of on record in the late history of the city of a politician's dropping a Boss's acquaintance on the score of character. The rest of the ticket might be better than it is, but the person on it who is most violently abused just at present is the candidate for Surrogate, Mr. Delano C. Calvin. Mr. Calvin was nominated last year, and was beaten by the combination of Republicans and Anti-Tammany, but was afterwards made Surrogate by appointment to fill a vacancy. The charge against him is that, as referee, he allowed a claim against the city for legal services which was on its face excessive and fraudulent. The services covered a period of several years, and the amount of the award was nearly four hundred thousand dollars. Mr. Calvin's answer is that the allowance was fair, and made in accordance with common rules applicable to the case. There seems to be no proof of fraudulent motive, and the counsel for the city in the reference entirely acquits Mr. Calvin of any improper intention. It is also to be noticed that the case was appealable, so the decision did not settle it. At the same time, the case has subjected Mr. Calvin to a good deal of suspicion, and the nomination, under the circumstances, is rather a proof of the Boss's goodness of heart and staunchness in friendship than of far-seeing statesmanship. In the same way, we should have preferred not to see Mr. Richard Croker nominated for coroner. Mr. Croker is principally known as having been unfortunately "mixed up" in a row at the polls, a year ago, in which a man named McKenna was killed, and had the further bad luck to fall under suspicion of having killed him. Of this he was acquitted; but being acquitted of a charge of murder does not of itself constitute a high recommendation to office. Nominations like these, however, are among the inseparable consequences of Boss-government, which, even when tempered by reform editorials, is not perfect.

Ex-Governor Claflin's letter accepting the Republican nomination for Congress in Massachusetts has been published as a reply to those who assailed his nomination on account of his financial views as expressed in his address last April. In it he strongly condemns any repeal of the Resumption Act as likely to prove disastrous in its effects on business, but this is all he says about finance. He makes no correction of his wild views about the propriety of keeping all the greenbacks afloat, and in fact making the Government a permanent issuer of paper currency, or about "the importance" of giving the Secretary the power of suspending specie payments at his discretion. He is, therefore, still an unsafe man to send to Congress. He cannot since last April have reached firm financial ground, and he does not pretend that he has. That address, which was a deliberate and elaborate essay, showed that he had not reflected carefully on financial matters, and was not familiar with the history of finance, and had his head filled with the loose and crude notions that one hears in bar-rooms and street-cars. The proposal about suspension, in fact, revealed complete mental confusion about the very foundations of government, both in its relations to finance and executive responsibility. Such men as he cannot be trusted in Congress at this crisis on the strength of a regulation letter accepting a platform. No one can tell what muddle he would get into in the next Congress, or what crotchet he would become enamored of. If we are to have "reform within the party," worthy citizens like Mr. Claflin must be left at home in their counting-houses, where they will do most good and least harm, and the party creed must be sharply and clearly defined, and candidates sternly and strictly held to it. Vague concurrence in "tendencies" or "impulses" or "views" will not do any longer.

A curious case of "intimidation" in Secretary Chandler's Department has recently been made public. It appears that Mr. W. A. Babcock, an employee of the Patent-Office, had been promoted by rigid competitive examinations to the post of first assistant-examiner, and had given every evidence of capacity and fidelity in the discharge of his duties. Last spring, as Mr. Babcock is a Connecticut man, the Republican Committee of that State called upon him to vote their ticket, or to contribute something to the expenses of the canvass. This was a very moderate request, because commonly the practice is to demand both the vote and the pay, the voter in addition bearing his own expenses to and from Washington. But Mr. Babcock preferred to consider himself abstracted from politics, and disregarded the application as well as the threats of dismissal which accompanied it. The committee then had recourse to a higher power, and the examiner was speedily informed that charges had been preferred against him before Secretary Chandler on the ground of his refusal either to vote or pay money for political purposes, and that the Secretary desired a "report" on these two points. Mr. Babcock's report was that of a man of principle, but also, perhaps, that of a subordinate not duly mindful of the respect due his superior; and almost immediately after the spring election he was discharged, certainly to the detriment of the public service in the Patent-Office. Mr. Babcock's complaint, however, that because he is not a negro laborer and Chandler is not a Southern planter, he cannot invoke an act of Congress to punish the latter for "intimidation" and interference with the freedom of the ballot in his case, excites our astonishment. Has he never read in our columns the axiom laid down by Mr. George Bliss, that "an active interest in public affairs is and should be a recommendation to office, just as inattention to them should be a disqualification"?

The success of the Exhibition at Philadelphia has induced the Park Commissioners to permit the Main Building to remain permanently, subject to a right of terminating the permission at two years' notice, and the use of the hall for the purposes of an exhibition "for the pleasure and instruction of the public," at a low price

of admission. As the Centennial draws to an end, it is becoming more and more clear that, from a pecuniary point of view, the show, if not a success, will come further from being a failure than almost any of its predecessors—a result for which the managers ought to thank devoutly the newspapers, which by their hostile criticism prevented the enterprise, in its earlier stages, from being saddled upon the Government. The energy and business sagacity which they have since shown would probably have been completely paralyzed, if those connected with it had once got the idea that the Treasury was going to help them over all their difficulties. The number of admissions has far exceeded expectation. The small size of the population drawn upon as compared with Europe made it seem likely that Philadelphia would fare badly; but though the influx of foreigners has not been great, this country has made up for the deficiency, and the devices for attracting crowds on days devoted to particular States have drawn out unexpected numbers, until the calculations now made show a probability of not less than eight or nine million admissions at the close of the fair.

The home and foreign financial markets were agitated during the week by news relating to Turkish affairs. The tenor of this news changed from day to day, but at the close of the week the conclusion in the various markets was, that while war is among the possibilities of the not-distant future, it is not imminent. Gold, which bounded up to 113½ when war was first reported, settled down before the close of the week to 109½ and 110. In London, Consols, which fell from 96½ to 93½ on the same news, recovered to 94½ and 95. Sterling exchange here, which in the first flurry advanced to 4.86½ for demand bills, fell to 4.85½, the rise in gold having made possible a large increase in the supply of commercial bills. In the markets for breadstuffs and provisions there was a great advance early in the week and the markets had a decidedly strong tone; a good part of the advance in prices was subsequently lost, and the tone was, at the close, the reverse of strong. Naturally, the commotion in the foreign markets interfered with the sale abroad of new U. S. 4½ per cent. bonds, and by unsettling the price of gold here had the same effect in this market. Silver in London has advanced to 53d. per ounce English standard. Our Government is buying at \$1 15 per ounce, 1,000 fine, and the home market is not much above that price, which would make the gold value of the old silver dollar \$0.8894. The gold value of the U. S. legal-tender note for one dollar has ranged during the week between \$0.8988 and \$0.9122.

One of the latest "campaign stories" has been that "letters received in Washington" from London stated that the Syndicate would not make any further subscription to the new four and a half per cent loan until after the election, and that if Tilden should be elected no more bonds would be taken for fear lest the Democrats should issue more paper money, and wipe out the Resumption Act. Mr. Belmont has written to the papers stoutly denying this, he being the agent of the Rothschilds, the principal founders of the Syndicate, and saying, with much show of reason, that if there was any such feeling he would undoubtedly have heard of it. The *Evening Post* was the author of the note, and being thus assailed, it produced Mr. Morrill in corroboration, who says in substance that it is only too true. We have, as supporters of Hayes, done our very best to believe it, but have had to give up the attempt, because people who take these loans in Europe are usually guided by the opinions of the bankers who place them, and these bankers, of course, know perfectly well that the Republicans will have a majority in the Senate, and at least an equality in the House for two years, at the shortest, of the next Presidential term, and that, therefore, there is no danger (supposing them to trust the Republicans, as they are said to do), of any measure of repudiation. In fact, we

think there was a good deal of winking in "headquarters" and "editorial sanctums" when this story was started. Of course, the charge in the Democratic platform that a change was needed in order to restore the credit of the Government was mere verbiage. The credit of the Government *is* good—considering the performances of Congress during the last ten years, wonderfully good—but its goodness is not due to wise legislation or prudent management, or to anything else for which a party can take credit. It is due to the fact that an enormous load of taxation, imposed with little or no care or skill or knowledge, has been patiently and bravely met by an industrious and honest people, and that the officers of the Government, instead of running off with the money or dividing it among themselves, have used a part of it to pay the interest on the public debt. This is all there is in the Republican share in restoring the public credit. Which of the two parties has tried most to damage the public credit by their bills and acts and resolutions and platforms and public speeches we should find it very hard to decide positively, but we think that, on the whole, considering the smallness of their opportunities, the Democrats are entitled to the palm. The most serious blow ever struck at the public credit was the Inflation Act of 1874, which the President vetoed, and for this both parties were responsible: the Republicans were divided, and the Democrats turned the scale.

It may be laid down as one of the first principles of national finance that the credit of a country is composed of all the contingencies that arise out of its political system. That is to say, when capitalists lend to a constitutional government they do not lend on the hypothesis that one party will remain in power; they take into account the possibility that the other party may get into power, and if the other party be unmistakably repudiationist, the fact shows itself in the rate of interest. The notion that the United States could borrow at four and a half per cent. if lenders really believed that the Democrats—a party comprising very nearly one-half the voting population, and only beaten by 9,000 or 10,000 in constituencies of 500,000—would repudiate if they succeeded in a Presidential contest or secured a majority in Congress, may therefore be pronounced absurd. A country situated as some Republican papers try to make foreigners believe the United States is, could not borrow at ten per cent., or even twelve. Our Government paid twelve in 1860, because it was well known that trouble was brewing and that an attempt at disruption might occur at any time. It only pays four and a half now, not because foreigners believe the Republican party to be a holy party and always sure of office, but because they believe the majority of the people of the Union are honest, intelligent, industrious, and patriotic, and careful of the national honor, and will remain so whatever party may be in power, and that the Government rests on solid and enduring foundations.

We have discussed elsewhere the present condition of the Turco-Servian quarrel. The way in which Russia reached her present advanced position appears to have been this: Austria, which has all along been made timid and suspicious by the growth of the Herzegovinian insurrection into a Slavic "movement," and which dreads either the rise of a Slavic power on her border or a Slavic addition to her own population, got completely out of patience over the elevation of Prince Milan to a kingship by the Servian army, and sent strong messages of disapproval to Belgrade. This was, of course, reported to St. Petersburg, and drew forth an autograph letter from the Czar to the Emperor, which was sent to Vienna by special messenger; it proposed the occupation of Bulgaria by Russia, and of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria, and the strict definition of the term "autonomy" for these provinces used in the English proposals of accommodation, so as to make it mean quasi-independence, like that of Servia. In the meantime the Porte was struggling with Sir Henry Elliott, who was

bullying it under instructions from home, and adroitly met his plan of reform for the revolted provinces by offering to spread "reform" over the whole Empire through a Grand Council, and a number of local councils, containing representatives of both creeds, which is, of course, mere trifling. The reply of Austria has apparently either not proved satisfactory, or has satisfied the Czar that he has nothing to fear from her in the way of positive opposition. He has accordingly announced his intention of occupying Bulgaria, but it seems likely that it will not be carried out at once, and that there is time for further negotiation. The latest accounts seem to indicate that the British Government does not expect war, but will probably treat any hostile advance in the direction of Constantinople as justifying precautions of some kind on its own part.

A second Russian messenger to Vienna has not, it appears, brought Austria to terms; but, on the other hand, neither Austria nor any other Power has supported the Turkish proposal of a six months' armistice as against the Servo-Russian one of a six weeks' armistice, and there has been, within a week, a meeting of the diplomatists at the Russian Embassy at Constantinople: General Ignatieff, the Minister, having returned from Livadia, the Czar's country-house in the Crimea, doubtless fully charged with the Imperial views. The main point of difference between England and Russia now is as to the degree of interference with the internal administration of Turkey which must take place. Russia would exercise foreign military supervision over the execution of the reforms, while England would trust more to mere foreign civil supervision, or the more active and complete participation of the Christians in the local government, while Turkey would like to put aside the whole matter by means of a grand scheme of general reform. Turkey, in short, desires "reform within the party," while the Powers want to put in a few outsiders to see what is going on, and make sure that the agreement is kept. In fact, there is no wrong-doer in the world who, if he has to reform, does not prefer "reform within the party"—that is, to be allowed to reform himself at his own time and in his own way—and who cannot always give you a dozen reasons why self-reform is likely to be far safer and more efficacious than reform imposed by external pressure. Austria, it is now announced, is willing to go into the joint occupation, if requested to do so by the Six Signatory Powers (of the treaty of Paris), but in that case she will operate against Servia and compel the break up of the Russo-Servian force. Hostilities have been resumed between the Turks and Servians, and the Turks appear to have turned the right wing of the position at Aleximatz.

The Russian threat that it will occupy Armenia as well as Bulgaria is due to the increasing complaints of "atrocities" and acts of oppression which come in from that quarter, and which have been published at Constantinople by a leading Armenian merchant in that city. The province is remote and rarely reached by travellers, and the unfortunate Armenians are in contact with the Kurds, the most barbarous of the Turkish hordes, who pillage and murder them, and carry off their women, and forcibly convert them to Mohammedanism, with great frequency. The only organs of communication with the Government which the Christians possess are their own bishops, but even these have been cowed into silence. The old Derebegs too, or former feudal lords of the region, who lost their privileges years ago by the Tanzimat, or body of reformatory legislation growing out of the declaration of principles called the Khatti Sherif of Gulhane, issued in 1839, have nevertheless ever since tried to compensate themselves for the loss of their dues by open plunder. These evils are, of course, aggravated just at present by the religious excitement of the Mohammedan population; so that Russia will be able to supply plenty of justification on paper for any overt acts of interference to which she may now choose to proceed.

THE POLITICAL RETROSPECT.

FIVE months ago there was no one who did not concede that the great contest between the Republican and Democratic parties was to be essentially a personal one. Had it been otherwise—had the two parties been sharply contrasted by fixed lines of policy rigidly enforced within the party ranks; had they not, in fact, been divided and tolerant of division on almost all the leading questions of the day—the interest in the nominations at St. Louis and Cincinnati would have been quite different from what it actually was. There was, it is not too much to say, a general agreement that, in respect of consistency of purpose and title to assume the reins of government, the parties were equal. If, on the one hand, the Democratic leaders still showed Bourbonish instincts, and the Democratic rank-and-file still included the lowest elements of our population, it was felt that a strong and able man like Tilden might infuse new ideas into the one and keep in check the other. If, on the other hand, the Republican leaders were hopelessly wedded to the corrupt practices of men who wish to retain themselves at all hazards in power, and incapable of initiating reform within the party, it was hoped that Hayes might resist, and, if not overcome them, at least expose them in their true light to a party on the whole favorable to good government and not desirous of being led by knaves. In short, party discipline, by drying up the springs of independent action, had reduced both constituencies to a nonentity, and the country practically to the condition of Russia, in which reform can proceed from the Czar alone—from above, and not from below.

In this state of things, when the revival of the Democratic South and the growth of Republican dissatisfaction at the North made the election certain to be a close one, what was the proper policy of the Republican politicians, whether editors of newspapers or stump orators? Their natural course as politicians was to accept and even to insist upon the personal issue. Not only, however, as we have shown, did this involve the fatal concession of a practical equality between the parties, but it may safely be said that no Presidential election within the memory of the younger generation has been determined by campaign charges directed against a candidate. Such charges would not be so frequent as they are if the utterers of them ever supposed they would pass current without discount, and in practice men make so much allowance for them that no newspaper's character for veracity is ever judged by its "campaign supplement." But there is still another ground on which the policy of personal detraction seems ill-advised. When a party which has never depended on personal leadership for its cohesion begins to go to pieces, it is not to be saved by attacking the opposite leader. This is all the more true of the Republican party the more you admit that they are controlled by moral motives. So long as it is not Grant but "Grantism"—i.e., the Senatorial administration of the country for the past ten years—which disturbs the minds of the conscientious, and prepares them for the desperate step of quitting the party ranks, the appeal is misdirected which consists in blackening any individual on the other side. To hold them in place, to recover their allegiance, to re-cement the half-detached fragments of the party, it is necessary to awaken enthusiasm for a principle whose very advocacy will have the desired purifying and elevating effect. It seemed for a moment as if the folly which nominated Hendricks at St. Louis had furnished the means of consolidating the Republican party, by making the financial question the paramount interest of the campaign. A statesman of high aims could have asked no better opportunity of conducting the canvass so that at the end, no matter who was elected, his party would have acquired at least one shibboleth, and received valuable instruction in the science of political economy.

Civil-service reform was, of course, the alternative text from which to derive the duty of standing by the Republican party. But in this case the task was harder, because decency would have required the temporary shelving of leaders whose "record" was hostile or unpromising, and there were many more of such than

there were of repudiationists and inflationists. Still, the attempt was worth making, especially because professions of ability to bring about reform within the party could hardly be tested in any other way. On every other question public opinion can sooner or later make itself felt and have its way; on this it has hitherto been impotent and is still at the mercy of the Machinists. Both parties having been compelled to declare civil-service reform an article of their creed, the rôle of whichever was in earnest about it was to state clearly what steps it meant to take to carry out the reform. One good result of this would have been to draw out a rival programme, and then, whether Hayes or Tilden got the Presidency, we should have had an administration pledged to do something definite towards the separation of politics and office-holding. It is needless to say that here again the Republicans, with rare exceptions, shirked a public duty, and lost a chance that may not recur in four years to educate the people on the most vital point in the conduct of any government. The canvass is nearly at an end, and it cannot be pretended that during any part of it "the schoolmaster was abroad." If voters have learned anything at all; if they are prepared to select their representatives with more care, or to discern paper-money fallacies that lately imposed on them, or to favor measures directed against Congressional patronage, they owe it to accident and not to any concert on the part of Republican orators. It is significant that in a State like Massachusetts, not closely contested, the regular Republican nominations for Congress are mostly of a low and in part of the lowest order, and will either neutralize the influence of the State or cast it in favor of a dishonest currency, a corrupt civil service, and an irrational treatment of the South.

A campaign of reason may have seemed hopeless to the National Executive Committee, headed by Secretary Chandler. A campaign of feeling was easy and familiar. The war-chord has for ten years been struck on every occasion, and it has not yet snapped. The Republicans deliberately made all other questions subordinate to the Southern question; it has been everywhere given prominence in the canvass, and it has culminated in the apotheosis of Blaine. We have their word for it, therefore, that the South will be the chief occupation of the incoming administration, and they have narrowed the debate for the independent voter to the one query: Will the Southern problem be soonest and most effectually disposed of, with the greatest benefit to the country, by Hayes or by Tilden? Such a narrowing can hardly be thought politic. The independent voter might better have been allowed to weigh the candidates and the parties on half a dozen grounds—on as many as ingenuity could suggest. Suppose we were told that the decision turned upon the superior Puritan ancestry of Hayes or Tilden; or upon the one being married and the other a bachelor; or upon the one having served in the army and the other having always been a civilian; or upon the one having been a criminal lawyer and the other a civil lawyer. This would make voting easy, but it might not help the side that imposed so restricted a choice. So in the case of the two parties, a voter might feel safer with the Republicans on financial and civil-service grounds, while, looking simply at the South, he would see more hope in a thorough change of administration. Those who have always thought the condition of the South the main question, or who now take the party's word for it that it is so, are at once confronted with the results of Republican attempts to grapple with it. A candid study of these results, it must be frankly said even by an intending supporter of Hayes, would not be favorable to the party's pretensions. It would not appear that they have any claims to further indulgence in experiment with so delicate and fundamental a problem. The capacity they have shown for *not* settling it is all the capacity that can be inferred from their recent history, and if they demand to be tried on this issue alone the verdict is already made up.

We do not say that in our opinion the election of Tilden would be of happier omen, at once for the South and for the whole country, than Hayes's. As in so many of the points of difference between them, we can calculate with tolerable certainty what will happen if Tilden succeeds, while we can only hope in the case of Hayes.

But the hope we cherish with regard to the South is one which does honor to the Republican party—we mean the men who compose it, not the men who “run” it. That Mr. Hayes will be neither arbitrary, nor unconstitutional, nor prone to interfere, like his predecessor, we are willing to believe; and we confess that if he could become the exponent of the real sentiment of the North towards the South, which is not one of oppressiveness nor even unfriendliness, we should consider it a surer guaranty of lasting peace and reconciliation than a sudden turn-about by a Democratic *deus ex machina*. As we intimated last week, it would be a positive misfortune to excite any illusions in the breasts of Southern Hotspurs. An administration firmly holding to the constitutional results of the war, but recognizing the errors of carpet-bag reconstruction, and able to convince the South of its sincerity, seems to us likely to obliterate more speedily the traces of war than an administration which the South itself has had a hand in electing. We advance this opinion for what it is worth. Our only concern is to point out that the stress laid upon the Southern question as overshadowing every other may prove to have been all that was needed to decide the wavering to vote against Hayes, when a larger liberty to weigh the merits of the two parties might have ended in striking a balance in his favor.

THE TURKISH CRISIS.

THE crisis in European politics brought about by the Turkish war gains in interest and presents new phases every week. The excitement over the Turkish atrocities in Bulgaria, indeed, promises to furnish one of the most curious episodes in recent political history. The British public was clearly thrown off its balance by the horrors to which it was treated, and the fury against the Turks rose with tremendous rapidity under the influence of Lord Beaconsfield's flippancy and Mr. Gladstone's burning rhetoric. Indeed, Mr. Gladstone forms the oddest figure in the fray. He has always had an ocean of rhetoric in him with which he would long ago have deluged the country if he had not been held in check by the *convenances* of official life; and the liberty to pour it forth in and out of season which his retirement from official life brought him, was probably more than compensation for the loss of power. Having disposed of the Pope, he was perhaps looking around for a new foe, when the Turk appeared on the scene with his dripping sabre, and received a glowing pamphlet full in the face, calling for the expulsion of the whole Mohammedan population from Europe, and otherwise “waving the bloody shirt,” as we should say, in a frantic manner. He was backed up by a wonderful popular uprising, in which the distrust of Russia on Turkish matters was talked of as an antiquated superstition, and the Ministry was called on to do something decisive to the Turkish Empire. The news of this, of course, spread rapidly in the East, and produced its effect in hardening the Servians in their resistance, which was probably what was expected; but it was probably not foreseen that it would precipitate Russian action, and this is nevertheless what has happened. The scene has completely changed since England's refusal to co-operate and her sending the fleet to Besika Bay, which killed the Berlin Memorandum. Under the news of the English anti-Turkish agitation the Servians have risen from despondency and timidity into obstinacy and arrogance; the Russian volunteers have poured into Tchernaeff's camp in greater numbers than ever; and Tchernaeff himself, as if feeling the importance of keeping the pot boiling, has begun telegraphing accounts of “atrocities” to the London *Daily News*, just as Governor Chamberlain or Senator Spencer might send on stories of “outrages” to the New York *Times* during this canvass. The general Continental opinion, in fact, appears to be that the popular excitement in England has paralyzed the Ministry and effectually prevented it from taking any decided action on the Turkish side, and this impression speedily led to Russia's abruptly separating herself from the other mediators and announcing her intention of occupying Bulgaria and portions of Armenia in the interest of humanity, or, in other words, declaring war.

In the meantime a sobering process has begun in England, and

Russia's action has doubtless greatly hastened it. The complexity of the Turkish problem was not plain during the excitement over the massacres, but it is now very plain indeed. Lord Derby's question, “What do you want us to do?” is producing visible embarrassment among those who have been loudest in their denunciations of him. Suppose Russia should invade Turkey in great force, and Germany should refrain from interfering, and Austria be afraid to interfere, and Turkey were to collapse suddenly, as she probably would, England to allow Constantinople to be occupied? If she does, is she to take no fresh precautions for the security of her Indian communications, and if so, what? These are weighty questions, and they cannot be answered at public meetings, and many of the agitators apparently feel on hearing them as if a bucket of cold water had been discharged on their heads. Russia has evidently taken it for granted that the agitation will have a master influence on English policy, and has acted accordingly. She will probably now begin hostilities at her leisure, and English opinion is veering toward a course of armed observation, to be turned into armed intervention if necessary, but strictly with an eye to her own interests and without regard to the fate of the Christian population of Turkey, which, as is plain to be seen, must be decided by the three great military powers.

The difficulties of military co-operation in an enterprise in which all the parties are not equally interested, or rather equally disinterested, have been many times exemplified of late, and notably in the Austro-Prussian operations against Denmark and in the French expedition to Mexico. One or other of the allies is almost sure to find himself carried further than he intended to go, or involved in responsibilities which he never anticipated. A joint interference of England and Russia in Turkey would not be undertaken with the same motives, or aims, or even with the same instruments. It would inevitably consist, on Russia's part, in the unimpeded entrance of a large Russian force into the heart of Turkey, and on England's of the entrance of the fleet into the Bosphorus, and possibly the landing of a small body of troops. That differences would speedily arise as to the nature and object and proper termination of the enterprise there can be little doubt, and when they arose England's sole remedy would be to withdraw. She could not expel Russia from Turkey if she were once fairly planted in it, and no power in Europe could now, except Germany. That the resistance of the Turks will amount to much is a mere chimera. The inferences that so thoughtful a paper as the London *Economist* draws from the siege of Silistria in 1854 as to what the Turks might do if pushed to the wall, are drawn in forgetfulness of the fact that during that siege the allies held the Black Sea and were in considerable force at Varna. Had the Russians been in possession of the sea, and had there been no European troops on the road to Constantinople, they would doubtless have done what General von Moltke suggested they would do in his Memoir on the war of 1829—have masked Silistria and Shumla, and gone straight down along the coast. Moreover, the desperation of the Mussulman population is undoubtedly a mere bugbear. This is to be feared as against the Christian population before the arrival of a conquering force, but no invader has anything to dread from it. The Turk, as well as other people, more readily than many people, is cowed by big battalions or any other manifestation of overwhelming strength. He does not know much about law or justice or humanity, but he knows what the order of a general of division means, and he heeds it.

The last Russian proposition is said to be the occupation of Bulgaria and Servia by her own forces, and that of Bosnia and Herzegovina by Austria. That Austria will refuse or hesitate is almost certain, from the fact that any serious additions to the Empire of Slavie population or influence would threaten its dissolution. The Empire is now substantially administered by Magyars and Germans, ruling a large and discontented mass of Slavs; and if once drawn into the tide of Slavie aspiration on the side of Turkey, it would be difficult to say what would come of it. An occupation of Herzegovina by Austria alone was talked of in the early days of the insurrection, and was at one time among the probabilities; but it would

have been undertaken in the sincere desire to restore order and quiet on the frontier and prevent the rising of burning questions. In conjunction with Russia at the head of a Pan-Slavic crusade, and over the ruins of the Turkish Empire, it is less likely by far, and might end in a considerable contribution of Austrian territory to help to make a new Slavic State.

There is talk at this writing of a determination on England's part, in case of a Russian invasion, to hold Constantinople or occupy Egypt. The former would appear to be a very difficult military operation without a large land force. The Bosphorus is commanded by lines of hills whose occupation and fortification would be necessary to the safety of the fleet lying below; but it must be added that it is extremely unlikely that any Russian army would long seriously threaten it without having command of the Black Sea. The occupation of Egypt, which is also talked of, would be a much easier and more profitable feat of arms, and would be much more effective as a guarantee for the communication with India. But the fate of Constantinople is something in which the whole world will feel the strongest interest. Next to Rome, there is no spot of earth around which so many great historic associations cluster as around the old capital of the Eastern Empire, and there is hardly any spot of earth more blessed in "sun, soil, and station." In the hands of a people who to strong artistic taste united skill in the art of living, it would become one of the most attractive resorts on the globe—a superb city, in which the frivolous and restless elegance of the West would be sobered and chastened by contact with Eastern repose.

CLERGYMEN AS SCIENTIFIC MEN.

NOT the least interesting feature in the discussion about the theory of evolution is the prominent part taken in it by clergymen of various denominations. There is hardly one of them who, since Huxley's lectures, has not preached a sermon bearing on the matter in some way, and several have made it the topic of special articles or lectures. One minister in Boston, Mr. Cook, has delivered two or three lectures on it, and Dr. Taylor, in New York, has assailed Huxley's position in a letter to the *Tribune*. Other ministers have attacked the hypothesis in the religious quarterlies. In fact, we do not think we exaggerate when we say that three-fourths of all that has been recently said or written about it in this country, has been said or written by ministers. There is no denying that the theory, if true, does, in appearance at least, militate against the account of the creation given in the first chapter of Genesis, or, in other words, against the view of the origin of life on the globe which has been held by the Christian world for seventeen centuries. It would, therefore, be by no means surprising that ministers should meet it, either by showing that the Mosaic account of the Creation was really inspired—was, in short, the account given by the Creator himself—or that the modern interpretations of it were incorrect, and that it was really, when perfectly understood, easily reconciled with the conclusions reached of late years by geologists and biologists. This is the way in which a great many ministers have hitherto met the Evolutionists, and for this sort of work they are undoubtedly fitted by education and experience. If it can be done by any one, they are the men to do it. If it be maintained that the Biblical account is literally true, they are more familiar than any other class of men with the exegetical process by which this reconciliation can be effected. They are specially trained in ecclesiastical history and tradition, in Greek and Hebrew religious literature, and in the methods of interpretation which have been for ages in use among theologians.

Of late, however, they have shown a decided inclination to abandon the purely ecclesiastical approach to the controversy altogether, and this is especially remarkable in the discussion now pending over Huxley. They do not seek to defend the Biblical account of the Creation, or to reconcile it with the theory of the Evolutionists. Far from it, they have come down in most of the recent cases into the scientific arena, and are meeting the men of science with their own weapons. They tell Huxley and Darwin and Tyndall that their evidence is imperfect, and their reasoning from it faulty. Noticing their activity in this new field, and the marked contrast which this activity presents to the modesty or indifference

of the other professions—the lawyers and doctors, for instance, who on general grounds have fully as much reason to be interested in evolution as the ministers, and have hitherto been at least as well fitted to discuss it—we asked ourselves whether it was possible that, without our knowledge, any change had of late years been made in the curriculum of the divinity schools or theological seminaries, with the view of fitting ministers to take a prominent part in the solution of the increasingly important and startling problems raised by physical science. In order to satisfy ourselves, we lately turned over the catalogues of all the principal divinity schools in the country to see if any chairs of natural science had been established, or if candidates for the ministry had to undergo any compulsory instruction in geology or physics, or the higher mathematics, or biology, or palaeontology, or astronomy, or had to become versed in the methods of scientific investigation in the laboratory or in the dissecting-room, or were subjected to any unusually severe discipline in the use of the inductive process. Not much to our surprise, we found nothing of the kind. We found that, to all appearance, not even the smallest smattering of natural science in any of its branches is considered necessary to a minister's education; no astronomy, no chemistry, no biology, no geology, no higher mathematics, no comparative anatomy, and nothing severe in logic. In fact, of special preparation for the discussion of such a theme as the origin of life on the earth, there does not appear to be in the ordinary course of our divinity schools the smallest trace.

We then said to ourselves, But ministers are modest, truthful men; they would not knowingly pass themselves off as competent on a subject with which they were entirely unfitted to deal. They are no less candid and self-distrustful, for instance, than lawyers and doctors, and a lawyer or doctor who ventured to tackle a professed scientist on a scientific subject to which he had given no systematic study, would be laughed at by his professional brethren, and would suffer from it even in his professional reputation, as it would be taken to indicate a raw and untutored state of mind, and a dangerous want of self-knowledge. Perhaps, then, the training given in the divinity schools, though it does not touch special fields of science, is such as to prepare the mind for the work of induction by some course of intellectual gymnastics. Perhaps, though it does not familiarize a man with the facts of geology, and biology, and astronomy, it so disciplines him in the work of collecting and arranging facts of any kind, and reasoning from them, that he will be a master in the art of proof, and that, in short, though he may not have a scientific man's knowledge, he will have his mental habits.

But we found this second supposition as far from the truth as the first one was. Moreover, the mental constitution of the young men who choose the ministry as a profession is not apt to be of a kind well fitted for scientific investigation. Reverence is one of their prominent characteristics, and reverence predisposes them to accept things on authority. They are inclined, too, to seek truth rather as a means of repose than for its own sake, and to fancy that it is associated closely with spiritual comfort, and that they have secured the truth when they feel the comfort. Though last not least, they enter the seminary with a strong bias in favor of one particular theory of the origin of life and of the history of the race, and their subsequent studies are marked out and pursued with the set purpose of strengthening this bias and of qualifying them to defend it and spread it, and of associating in their minds the doubt or rejection of it with moral evil. The consequence is that they go forth, trained not as investigators or enquirers, but as advocates, charged with the defence against all comers of a view of the universe which they have accepted ready-made from teachers. A worse preparation for scientific pursuits of any kind can hardly be imagined. The slightest trace of such a state of mind in a scientific man—that is, of a disposition to believe a thing on grounds of feeling or interest, or with reference to practical consequences, or to jump over gaps in proof in order to reach pleasant conclusions—discredits him with his fellows, and throws doubt on his statements. We are not condemning this state of mind for all purposes. Indeed, we think the widespread prevalence of the philosophic way of looking at things would be in many respects a great misfortune for the race, and we acknowledge that a rigidly-trained philosopher would be totally unfit for most of a minister's functions; but we have only to describe a minister's education in order to show his exceeding unfitness for contentions such as some of his brethren are carrying on with geologists and physicists and biologists. In fact, there is no educated calling whose members are not, on the whole, better equipped for fighting in scientific fields over the hypothesis of evolution. Our surprise at seeing lawyers and doctors engaged in it would be very much less justifiable, for a portion at least of the training received in these professions is of a scientific cast,

and concerns the selection and classification of facts, while a clergyman's is almost wholly devoted to the study of the opinions and sayings of other men. In truth, theology, properly so called, is a collection of opinions. Nor do these objections to a clergyman's mingling in scientific disputes arise out of his belief about the origin and government of the world *per se*, because one does not think of making them to trained religious philosophers; for instance, to Principal Dawson or Mr. St. George Mivart. Some may think or say that the religious prepossessions of these gentlemen lessen the weight of their opinions on a certain class of scientific questions, but no one would question their right to share in scientific discussions.

We are moved to speak on this subject by the regret which we feel at seeing educated and influential men, from perhaps the most influential body of educated men in the country, helping by their example to spread the already too prevalent delusion that training is not needed to enable a man to talk or think with profit to himself or others on any subject, and it is a delusion which—let us say—helps to cut the ground from under the feet of religious as well as of other teachers. It furnishes the subtle poison which debauches politics, and makes so much labor in all fields slight and inefficient, and which renders education hasty and slipshod, and scholarship shallow and pretentious. Reading over the other day the Rev. Joseph Cook's lectures in Boston, in which he demolished the evolutionists by means of detached sentences from the works now of one and now of another, put together with considerable rhetorical skill and seasoned with flippancy, and presented in such a way as to make it appear that the geologists and biologists and physicists and naturalists—the Lyells, Huxleys, Haeckels, Darwins, Helmholtzs, and others who have co-intenanced and supported the hypothesis of evolution, and given to it years or lives of laborious and conscientious investigation—were a set of charlatans or dreamers, whose chief use was to make clerical "Monday lectures" funny, we confess we doubted whether we had of late heard of any more melancholy spectacle or one likely to prove more mischievous. What was most melancholy about it was, however, not the assault on laborious investigators by a gentleman whose acquaintance with the subject in hand is at best very small, but the apparent unconsciousness of both the orator and his audience that there was anything absurd or humiliating in his position. Let us assure the ministers who enjoy and participate in this sort of sport that it is not the men of science they are injuring or degrading; it is their own order and vocation. If they will only look back, they will see that the history of the relation of religion to science has consisted in the main of the acceptance by theologians of scientific hypotheses over which they at first laughed or were angry, and that this acceptance has only damaged theology when the acceptance was grudging or ill-tempered. How many unpleasant and at first sight formidable truths have been swallowed since the day when the proposition over which the Rev. Joseph Cooks of the time doubtless made merry, that the earth was not the centre of the solar system but only a satellite of the sun, was first produced! Would it not be best for religion and morals to give up a struggle in which they may lose much and can win nothing? Can there be any gain wrought for either by pretending that there are some subjects on which one may be qualified to talk without having studied them? The world is not so simple as it used to be, or so ignorant. Plain people all over the country, in our day, know enough about the methods of scientific investigation to be familiar with Newton's Rule that a hypothesis which will explain a phenomenon, and against which no fatal objection is known, is a good and proper hypothesis to work on in investigation, and they expect those who assail it to produce one that will take its place. This ministers do not do. The Mosaic account of the creation explains nothing which now puzzles us. For—to use the dilemma presented to Mr. Cook by a distinguished physician—if men are the offspring of a single pair, and environment has not, as the Evolutionists say it has, modified them in character and conformation, what has caused the difference between Australian aborigines and Anglo-Saxons in the short space of six thousand years? If, on the other hand, the difference be due to the descent from a number of separately created pairs, what becomes of the Mosaic account? People are pondering these questions seriously, and they cannot be dismissed with a laugh. Would it not be well, therefore, for ministers to abandon the attitude of angry fugitives towards Science, and await its discoveries with calm, and watch the tentative efforts by which all its truths have been revealed with friendly or, at all events, courageous interest? For though a good ally, it may be a terrible because inevitable enemy.

"The Moving Finger writes, and, having writ,
Moves on; nor all your piety and wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it."

THE INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION—No. XIX.

THE CATTLE SHOW.

PHILADELPHIA, October 21.

DOUBTLESS the managers of the Exhibition had controlling reasons for banishing its Live-Stock department from the Exhibition grounds, though these reasons were by no means obvious to the uninformed mind of the visitor. There was ample room within the grounds for all of the animals shown, and where one person left the more attractive exhibits to walk half a mile and pay twenty-five cents to see the horses and cows, and then walk back again and pay fifty cents to return to the chief show, probably twenty persons would have gone to see the live stock if within the grounds and near the circular railway. Of course, those who had a personal or professional interest in stock-raising made the effort, and studied the display carefully; but there is a certain amount of instruction for the most casual visitor in an examination of cattle at a show which the visitors to the Centennial lost the opportunity of receiving.

On the grounds selected for the cattle show the arrangements were ample, convenient, and good. The facilities for examination, on the part of visitors and judges, and the opportunities for displaying stock, were certainly excellent. There was a suggestion of magnificent distances about the slimly-occupied sheds, which stood at two sides of the large enclosure, but on the whole the grounds, once reached, were better than could have been furnished at the foot of George's Hill.

The number of specimens of what are known as the leading breeds—Short-horns, Herefords, Devons, Ayrshires, and Dutch—was not large. Among the Short-horns, so far as I was able to judge, the average excellence was far below that of the larger collection at the National show at Springfield, Ohio, twenty years ago. There were more inferior animals, and the best did not seem better than my recollection of the best at Springfield. In a certain sense these animals have become much more interesting from the fabulous prices (in one instance \$30,000 for one cow) which have recently been paid for them. To those uninstructed in the refinements of the subject the value of the Short-horn, as an element of American farming, lies in the fact that crosses of this breed attain a large size and develop the preponderating part of the increased weight in the hind-quarters, where the more valuable meat lies. So far as our beef-raisers are concerned, an infusion of Short-horn blood is looked to to increase the value of their product very largely by throwing it into the higher-priced hind-quarters of their animals. Another and important benefit comes of the more quiet disposition, and the accompanying ease of fattening or profitable use of food consumed. To the dairy-farmer, the Short-horn seems a monstrosity, for its yield of milk is so reduced that it is almost unusual for a fine Short-horn cow to be able properly to suckle her own calf. The standard which influences the professional Short-horn breeder is quite incomprehensible to the average mind. It relates to a certain number of crosses of Booth or Bates blood, or some other combination which indicates an ancestry of prize-winners. Measured by the attention it has attracted, by the prices for which its best specimens sell, and by the enormous capital invested and the talent engaged in its development, this is certainly the leading race in the world. It was sufficiently well represented among the fifty-odd specimens shown at Philadelphia for the ordinary visitor to form a very good opinion as to its character.

The Ayrshires—a milk-giving race—were very fairly represented by something less than fifty specimens. There was a very good show of the less known Herefords (beefers), and the usual elements of fat cattle and working oxen.

In point of numbers, the Jerseys—miscalled Alderneys, for Alderney has no distinctive race, only a mixture of Jerseys and Guernseys—not only led the exhibition, but there were probably more of these than of all other breeds combined; not far from 150 head. This large showing was greatly due to the efforts made by the American Jersey Cattle Club to secure a full representation. This association, which has done much to foster the Jersey interest throughout the country, offered \$1,000, to be distributed in premiums: \$250 and \$100 each as first and second prize for cows and for bulls, and \$300 for the best herd—one bull and four cows. In addition to this, the Pennsylvania Agricultural Society offered \$100 for the best herd. Another reason for the number of Jerseys exhibited is doubtless to be sought in the fact that among Jersey breeders there are many men of wealth and leisure who were able to afford the time and cost of attending the show. Then, too, there are many herds in the neighborhood of Philadelphia from which animals for exhibition could be sent without difficulty.

This large collection of Jerseys was notable more for its extent than for its average quality. The other breeds are cultivated mainly by practical

men, who give their own best attention and study to the subject. There are many such among the Jersey breeders, but there are also many who keep these animals from almost purely fancy motives. A herd of Jerseys is getting to be an almost necessary accompaniment of an American country-seat—one of the incidental features of elegant rural life, like hot-houses, graperies, and lawn-shrubbery. As these latter are entrusted to the gardener, so the management of the cattle is entrusted to a more or less competent headman. The proprietor, having no eye to profit, and finding it often rather an advantage that his family and friends are able to consume the entire product of the dairy, has often found it easy to accept as a standard fancy characteristics which have no bearing upon productive quality. A pure *fashion* sprang up years ago in England, and was fostered by dealers and by some breeders in this country, and to no slight extent on the Island of Jersey as well, for animals without white markings and with black switches at the ends of their tails. Here was a standard for fanciers which involved no consideration of animal physiology, and toward which the veriest tyro could work with the smallest amount of mental effort. It was only necessary when a calf was born to keep it if it had the necessary color indications, or turn it over to the butcher, or give it to a friend, or sell it for a song, if it had white markings. A standard like this, faithfully followed, must result, in time, in a certain uniformity of color-breeding. Of course it would be possible, though by no means easy, to combine with this the butter-producing standard. As a rule, the combination has rarely been made here or abroad.

The Jersey is a race which has grown up in obedience to the demands of a population of small farmers in an extremely fertile island, where very small herds are kept, and where the money product has been almost entirely in butter. Starting with a productive race, and adapting it more and more to their needs, the farmers of Jersey have succeeded in producing an animal which, from a given amount of food, produces more and better butter than any other cow in the world. In addition, their cows have a beauty of form, a gentleness of expression and disposition, and a deer-like look, which gives them great ornamental value. In their origin they are a race of mixed colors, with an absence of white markings in occasional specimens, arising doubtless from an ancient cross with the cow of Brittany. Probably the Channel Islands cattle were originally derived from the herds of Normandy, from which the original population is supposed to have come.

Breeders in this country may be divided by a quite distinct line, a certain number having adopted the "solid color" standard as their chief aim, the others breeding chiefly for butter product. For several years past the injury being done to the practical reputation of the whole breed has been evident to many who are interested in its improvement and in its general adoption among the butter-makers of the United States. It has been found that these animals are hardy and thrifty in all parts of the country—in the extreme South as well as in Canada, in California as well as in Maryland—and they are, all over the country, rapidly exerting an influence among dairymen only second to that of the Short-horns among beef-raisers. While the average quality of the animals shown at Philadelphia—selected, of course, as the best of the herds which they represented—was really low, the exhibition was of great value as showing the injurious effect of the fancy breeding. I do not mean to say that all of the highest order of animals had white markings, nor that all of the poorest were without them; but one who by conversation with exhibitors learned the standard that guided them could see by the character of their exhibits how very far standard had influenced quality. The best and second best cow, and the second best bull, were parti-colored animals, while the best bull showed, by the coloring of his progeny exhibited with him, that, in his herd, color is not the chief point sought. The *herd* prize was awarded to Chas. L. Sharpless, of Philadelphia, who is well known to disregard the question of color entirely, and whose leading bull (who was a stout competitor for the first prize) is finely mapped with white. This is not the place for a discussion of the physiological bearings of this question of breeding to different standards, nor of the minutest details which the successful dairy-breeder must regard; but the Jersey is being so widely introduced among persons of "elegant leisure" that it does seem worth while to say what is said above, in the hope that the falling away of the absurd "color" fashion may be hastened, and the value of the still beautiful—in my opinion, more beautiful—butter-producer may be better appreciated.

An examination of the Jerseys and other dairy breeds, with reference to the curious system of Guenon, developed a strong confirmation of its truth. Indeed, the value of this system is very widely recognized, not only in France, where it originated, but in almost all of the continental countries, and among the more intelligent farmers of the Island of Jersey. In this country it is very generally considered, and, in the scale of points of the Jer-

sey Cattle Club, perfection in this regard counts ten in a scale of one hundred.

Guenon was a cow-boy, and, later, a dealer in cattle. Being of an observing turn of mind, he studied his animals closely. He observed that on the back part of the udder, on the inside of the thighs, and on the perineum there is an upward growth of hair, separated from the adjoining downward growth by a distinct line or quirl; that the space covered with this downward-growing hair varies in size and form; that it possesses certain marked peculiarities; and that there is a difference in the amount and color of the dandruff accumulating within the area. Continuing his investigation with animals whose quality he had daily opportunity to study, he found a close relation between this area, which he called the "escutcheon," or "milk-mirror," and the quantity, quality, and continuance of the secretion of milk. Slowly and carefully applying his observations to all herds which came under his notice, he finally established a system, dividing the escutcheon, according to its shape, into eight different classes, and each class, according to its size, into eight different orders—assigning to each order and class a certain quantity of milk and a certain duration of milk-giving after a new pregnancy. His system was severely tested in 1837 by the Agricultural Society of Bordeaux; he was awarded a gold medal and proclaimed a member of the society. Similar success accompanied similar examinations elsewhere, and this system, discovered and so developed by a simple French peasant as to call for no subsequent change, has now received the almost unqualified support of the leading dairymen of the world, who are influenced in their selection of animals for purchase or of calves for raising much more by the escutcheon than by any other single indication. It was noticeable at Philadelphia that the cows which gave, according to other standards, the best indication of dairy quality, ranked very high according to Guenon's classification, and that those which were obviously inferior ranked low in this scale also.

One of the most interesting of the minor features of the show was a small herd of polled (hornless) Galloway cattle from Canada. These are a jet-black, Scotch breed of large size and of extreme hardness. The bull took my fancy more than did any other animal of the beef breeds that were shown. In addition to the specific breeds there were notable working oxen, monstrous fat cattle, a few Guernseys, and a single Brittany. But for the absence of the Kerry cattle, all of the races best known in this country were represented.

It seems the fashion now to make more or less unfavorable criticism of the system of awards obtaining at the Centennial Exhibition. This is a system in which the award has no money value, in which the bronze token or medal is identical in all cases, and in which the true recompense of the successful exhibitor is to be sought in the commendation expressed in the diploma which accompanies the medal—a commendation setting forth the character of the meritorious qualities for which the award is given. For many classes of exhibits this system seems to be well adapted, but as the diploma gets its chief value from the qualifications of the experts signing it to express a commanding opinion as to its subject, it is hardly adapted to discriminations of merit among horned cattle, at least with the arrangement of judges adopted at the Centennial. One or two judges were selected from among those conspicuously interested in each of the different races. Now, a short-horned breeder has cultivated his taste and judgment exclusively in the direction of squareness of form, the judicious placing of flesh upon the carcass, and the general tendency to accumulate fat. All his efforts tend in this direction. The Jersey breeder, on the other hand, looks, first and chiefly, for a tendency to the production of butter and to persistence of milk-yielding. The one seeks to perfect an organism whose marked tendency shall be to deliver into the udder the largest possible proportion of the fat-yielding elements of the food; the other, an organism which shall store up fat in the carcass. The one sees excellence in leanness and the other in fleshiness; the one seeks a great development of the milk-producing organs, and the other regards such a development as a defect, as tending to rob the carcass of its coveted fat. The breeder of Ayrshire and Dutch cattle looks for the indications of the largest possible production of milk without much regard to the quantity of cream that it will produce; the Jersey breeder considers very copious milking an indication of thinness of milking; better for him a cow giving fifteen quarts of milk per diem of a very rich quality than one giving twenty quarts of much poorer quality. In short, each race is bred to a different standard, and every man must form his judgment according to the standard which he has made his specialty.

At Philadelphia the short-horn breeders were most fully represented among the judges, and there is no doubt that this race received just treatment; but it is quite likely that the other beefing and the milking races were

judged through the misfitting spectacles of men who were not the best suited to estimate their quality. It is not the least of the good work of the Jersey Cattle Club that it succeeded in having the Jerseys withdrawn entirely from the general arena and passed upon exclusively by experts from among its own members, who were guided in their judgment by a standard which it had itself set up for the guidance of Jersey breeders.

G. E. W., Jr.

FRANCE IN THE EUROPEAN COMPLICATION.

PARIS, October 6.

IT is impossible to speak or to think at the present moment of anything but the Eastern Question. It seems easier to be calm in St. Petersburg than in Paris. We are so situated that every electric current in Europe goes through our nervous system. There is no war party in France; from the *Communist* to the Legitimist, from the working-men to the heads of the army, you will find but one sentiment; it would be a crime for France to enter into any war. She was too severely punished in 1870; she must now be quiet, and her only duty is her own reorganization. She has no duty towards any other nation; every government congratulated the Emperor Wilhelm on his great victories; no government entered its protest against any of the conditions imposed on France by the treaties of Paris and Frankfort.

I remember writing at the time of these sad events that France, deprived of Alsace and Lorraine, cut from the German trunk and the German nationality, would become more isolated, less cosmopolitan, more Latin. It is not in the French character to turn savagely on everybody; still, I often perceive now, in our literature, in our social relations, in the development even of our sciences, a tendency to keep aloof from the outer world. Our amateurs have become exclusive devotees of every form of French art. We have ceased to abuse ourselves; we admire the fortility, the graces, the originality of the French mind in every style, from the time of the Renaissance to the time of the French Revolution. We look for the smallest and most delicate relics of our literature, of our schools of painting, of drawing, of engraving. We are becoming eclectic for France, unjust and exclusive with regard to many foreign things. Still, we cannot surround ourselves with a Chinese wall; we cannot shut Paris against the foreigner. We have invited again all the nations to a Universal Exhibition, and we are preparing to receive our enemies with the greatest courtesy. Any Alsacian who has chosen to remain a Frenchman cannot live a day in Alsace without the permission of the police. If he has neglected to ask this permission, in ignorance of the regulations of Berlin, he can be turned out in virtue of a French law of 1849, which allows the expulsion of all foreigners in twenty-four hours. This law is now turned against us, and it constantly happens that young men who have gone for a few days to Alsace, merely to see their old parents, are sent away by the police. We ignore these facts in France; we shut our eyes to what is going on beyond the Vosges.

A curious instance of this growing indifference to all external complications or accidents may be found in the campaign which has been carried on this summer for what is called the conversion of the French *rente*. If we were alone in the world, this conversion would soon become a possibility; but we seem always to forget why our debt was so largely increased. Prince Bismarck does not forget it; he explained with the utmost frankness to the German Parliament that, having to choose between two modes of diminishing the armaments of France, the mode adopted after Jena by Napoleon against Prussia—that is, the limitation of the active army—and a heavy fine which would act as a dead weight on the budget, he chose the second method as the most likely to be efficacious. Now, it happens that France had such wonderful resources, that her soil and her fertility are such, that the habits of the people—even those habits which are always denounced in England as marks of decadence—give her such advantages that she bears her actual budget, heavy as it is, lightly, and is capable of maintaining a very large army. The calculations of Germany have not been quite correct. Germany did not spend the five milliards of our ransom with perfect wisdom; she entered into too many speculations, and lost much money in unprofitable enterprises. It would be very absurd to imagine that she looks with much satisfaction on our present financial prosperity; it would be equally absurd if we imagined that our financial prosperity is so well secured that we can enter into a tremendous operation like the conversion of our five per cents into three per cents without the good-will of our powerful neighbors. A few articles in the German *Post* would be enough to knock the whole scheme on the head in a few days. I, for one, look in consequence with some fear and even disgust on the speculative fever which has seized our moneyed classes, as it did in the worst days of the Empire. Much as I respect the poor peasant or the hard-working artisan, who, from

patriotic motives, puts his small earnings in the French stocks, I deprecate this new method of playing the "grande nation" which would consist of making the Bourse of Paris the queen of all the Bourses of the world. We want seriousness and even austerity; our instincts are good, but they are constantly spoiled by bad habits. There is a substratum of real and profound patriotism in the people; but when I look only at Paris, at the rulers of the day, rulers of fashion, and rulers of politics, I cannot help being sometimes much discouraged.

This Eastern Question is come in time to wake us from many pleasant dreams. We are placed somewhat like the wise man of Lucretius, who enjoys seeing a tempest from a high cliff. But our quietude is not so great, and we have a dim perception that France cannot be quite unconcerned in European difficulties. It is almost impossible that Germany should get entangled in any great struggle with an Eastern power without asking France for some securities. The Eastern Question has its own merits, but in our eyes the chief interest of it lies now in this single question: Is Prussia likely to be drawn into it; and if she is, what part will she take? Will she be with Russia against Turkey and Austria, or will she be with Austria against Russia?

Our papers now call Prince Bismarck "the Mute of Varzin"; and he certainly has preserved a masterly silence for some time. That he had a hand in the preparation of the present difficulties, everybody believes; it is thought that he, perhaps not directly, but through the Italian Government, set fire to the little matches of Herzegovina and Montenegro. The Servian insurrection, which has now become very serious, was in its origin somewhat artificial. It has been evident from the first that the agitation in the Turkish provinces was the creation of diplomacy. That Russia has had much to do with it is quite evident, and she has now almost thrown off the mask. There are at least as many as 6,000 Russian soldiers and officers in the army commanded by Tcherniaeff; Prince Milan is a pensioner of the Czar; the Pan Slavist committees furnish Belgrade with money, arms, ammunition. The Servian war is in reality a Russian war—this is an evident fact; what is not so clear is the degree of complicity of Prussia in this movement against Turkey. There are some symptoms which would tend to indicate that Prussia is faithful to Russia, and remembers the great service which was rendered to herself in 1870 by the present Czar. Prince Charles of Hohenzollern, who is the ruler of Rumania, has done nothing to hinder the passage of arms and men through his territory. It is even said that he has made some sort of convention on the subject with the Russian Government. Prince Charles cannot be so independent of the Hohenzollerns that he acts entirely without their advice. On the other hand, he is so weak and unable to defend himself against Russia in case of war that he has not much to refuse to the Czar.

Prince Bismarck has for years made the Russian alliance the cornerstone of his policy; but he thinks perhaps that he has drawn out of this alliance all the good there was in it. There is no such thing as gratitude in politics. Prince Bismarck cannot neglect the dictates of public opinion in Germany; if you read the German papers, the papers of Berlin, of Cologne, of Breslau, of Augsburg, and of Vienna, you will find everywhere the expression of common sentiments on the subject of the Eastern Question. It is thought that Germany cannot renounce the old traditional policy of Austria. Austria was conquered at Sadowa, she was thrust out of the German Confederation as a penance; but this penance may be only temporary. The great Fatherland includes in reality all the German-speaking provinces of Austria; the time will come when the Hapsburgs will re-enter the great planetary system of the new Empire. What is Austria without the Danube? The mouths of the Danube and the free navigation of that river must be secured in the interests of Germany. If the Germany of the future renounces the old claims of the Empire on Italy, she cannot renounce the old claims on the border states which separate Hungary from the East; she cannot renounce her right of patronage over the half-savage tribes which form a vanguard against the great Slavic Empire.

The reticence of Prince Bismarck is easily explained, if you imagine that his mind is struggling between the duties which arise for Prussia from an alliance which has now continued since the last Polish rebellion, and the imperial instincts of the German race. The problem he has to solve is the most difficult that was ever placed before him. He has humbled Austria—it is not his interest to destroy her completely; he has received the help of Russia—it is not his interest to help her too much. Of one thing we may feel sure: Prince Bismarck is not likely to forget that he is a German, and he will sacrifice everything to the interests of the new Empire which he has so powerfully helped to create on the ruins of the old and tottering confederacy. The secret of the Eastern Question lies not in London, nor in St. Petersburg, but in Berlin.

Correspondence.

"THE TILDEN EDITOR OF THE NATION."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I got the enclosed from the columns of the *Tribune Blade* of this date. I had not supposed that Parke Godwin was in any way connected with the *Nation*, and I do not send it because of any belief in it; but I should like, if you think it worthy of an answer, to see it explained for the benefit of others.—Very respectfully,

T. LEBO, Oct. 14, 1876.

A READER OF THE NATION.

"It is all out now about Parke Godwin, the Tilden editor of the *Nation*. He is a chronic office-holder and office-seeker, filling lucrative positions under Polk and Pierce's administrations, and an unsuccessful applicant for office under Grant. Tilden caught him by finding a snug berth for his eldest son. He is a nice reformer."

[We are glad to hear that "it is all out now about Parke Godwin," and presume he will not be sorry himself. He has not, however, been "the Tilden editor of the *Nation*," to our knowledge, since Pierce's Administration; but this is as long as we can answer for. At all events, if he has been editing it since that time, he has been shamefully neglectful of his duties, as he has never written a line for it or even entered the office. Of his troubles with Grant about offices we know nothing, but are pleased to hear that Tilden has given his eldest son "a snug berth." If Tilden has "caught him," we hope he will treat him kindly.—ED. NATION.]

IS THE EXISTENCE OF SMALL COLLEGES AN EVIL?

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your article on "The University Problem," in No. 587 of the *Nation*, alludes to "the great evil of small colleges," and says "they cannot be got rid of," as if it were desirable to have them become extinct. I have noticed similar expressions in other of your very valuable articles on the higher education. While heartily concurring with most that you have said, I cannot but question the correctness of this position. I say this with the more confidence because I myself have been identified altogether with one of the largest and oldest of our colleges, and never with any of the small ones except as a disinterested observer.

If a college were of no use but to furnish facilities for education to students, it might be best, were it possible, to abolish some scores of the smaller ones, and give their property to the larger to increase their efficiency. But a college has other uses, and the public-spirited citizens of our new and growing communities are quick to see this, although some of our best writers on education seem strangely to overlook it. They see that the cities and towns which grow up about a college are ordinarily places of more culture, refinement, and moral purity than others; that superior men are attracted to them with their families; that persons of better character are recognized as leaders of society, and influences of all kinds have a higher tone. A college, even though it be small, is a civilizing and enlightening power for the community where it stands and the surrounding country; and such a power is needed to counteract the sordid and downward tendencies which are always operating. A people engrossed in the pursuit of wealth need reminders of the intellectual life which they shall see and feel daily; and what reminder is there like a college with its library and museum and laboratory, and its men devoted to intellectual pursuits? The smaller colleges have a local power which can hardly be supplied by anything else, and that power could not be transferred—it would be lost.

It is often assumed that the students of the small colleges would go to the larger ones if these did not exist. This is not so, I think. Most of them would not have been awakened to the value of an education, or to the practicability of acquiring it, if the college had not been near. Some would, but comparatively few. The small colleges draw to them men who would otherwise have remained farmers, mechanics, and tradesmen, or taken the short cut to professional life. Most of those who would have gone to the larger colleges do go as it is, attracted to them by the superior advantages they afford. Furthermore, the students of the small colleges receive an impulse to further and higher education after their graduation. Appreciating the fact that their opportunities have not been the best, they set about making up the deficiency. And so a very fair proportion of them will be found in the post graduate or professional departments of our largest colleges, and not a few at the universities of Europe.

Come down to the facts in the case, and it will be seen that the small colleges are doing much more for education in our country than they have credit for. They are the pioneers and subsoilers, "keeping alive," to use your own expressive words, "that devotion to intellectual work which is the salt of material civilization, and without which it would soon become a putrescent mass"; and this in regions where there is little else to keep such a devotion alive. It is more necessary, after all, to awaken the love of intellectual pursuits in the people than to provide an appreciative few with the amplest facilities for learning; and in this the smaller colleges are certainly doing their full share.

G. S. D.

LEWISTON, Me., Sept. 30, 1876.

A STUDENT'S NOTES AT GERMAN UNIVERSITIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The organization of our universities and the value of our colleges are now attracting considerable attention. Some desire that our colleges be entirely changed, or even done away with, and there are many who advocate imitating the German universities. Prolonged personal experience in Germany has led me to become opposed to both plans, although like other students I admire and envy the advantages offered to scientists, young and old, in Germany. It is quite true, as has often been said, that good professors and good laboratories are more numerous in Germany than elsewhere. That is the secret of their superiority. But the organization of our best universities is better, and as soon as we shall have as many good instructors we shall excel the Germans in higher education.

In order to justify this opinion I will mention what seems to me the defect of German universities and the merit of our college system. The former really produce nothing but specialists, who work hard at their science and contribute enormously to its promotion, but proportionately display great originality less often than learned men in other countries. In fact, we find that almost every science originated outside of Germany. Political economy is of English origin, and so is geology; chemistry, comparative anatomy, and paleontology are French, and so on through a long list. The organization of German universities offers encouragement to specialists only. A young man who has taken a degree and wishes to continue at the university must make a special investigation to become a "Privat-docent." He then selects for a course of lectures a special subject out of a restricted field, and makes more investigations; if he is successful, he may be fortunate enough to be appointed an extraordinary professor. He is promoted, as a rule, according to the merits of his original scientific work. This is at once the good and the bad side of German universities. The system makes every one anxious to carry out independent researches and fosters a scientific spirit such as exists nowhere else. All foreigners are deeply impressed by this, and are apt to take away an excess of admiration because they do not become aware of the bad aspects of the case. Very often one finds professors who are splendid investigators, and have therefore obtained high positions which they are unfit to fill because they have no capacity for teaching.

But higher education certainly means the production of highly cultivated men for ordinary life, as well as producing only what the German universities do—men trained for one of the learned professions, and scientific workers whose intellectual apparatus in every case is to be applied to a particular purpose. Our good colleges give us young men of high general culture. That is their great merit. A lad entering a German university not to study law or medicine nor to become a scientist, but to perfect his general education, finds himself at a sad loss; there is no appointed course he can follow, no one officially qualified to tell him what combination of lectures to choose. In German society one finds the learned men separated by a gap, oftentimes painfully evident, from the rest who have only a gymnasial education—that is, about as much as a Harvard student has at the end of his freshman year. In America, on the contrary, savants are rarer, but great cultivation and wideness of views are found in private life, especially in the older cities. The intellectual inferiority of America as measured by her scientific work naturally makes us feel sad about our country, but we can find some consolation in high culture being so general.

For these reasons I cannot agree with those who wish to abolish our colleges; but I see with pleasure that attempts to combine the valuable special training as offered in Germany with our institutions for general learning are being successful. The introduction of well-organized post-graduate courses cancels the defects which formerly existed, while the schools of medicine, law, etc., offer nearly as great advantages as the special faculties at German universities. The organization of Harvard, for example, will, I think, be found in the end better than that of the German

universities. As every one acknowledges that the number of good university instructors is smaller than our needs, it is pleasant to see that the number of Americans studying abroad is very great, and that a large proportion of them have gone to Europe especially to become scientific teachers at home afterwards. On the whole, therefore, we can certainly look hopefully towards the future to bring us the intellectual progress needed to put us abreast with Europe.

C. S. M.

BOSTON, OCT. 3, 1876.

Notes.

J. R. OSGOOD & CO. make of Longfellow's 'Skeleton in Armor' a holiday volume, illustrated by Miss Mary A. Hallock. They will also publish a new volume of poetry, 'That New World,' by Mrs. J. J. Piatt. —The publishers of the *Atlantic Monthly* announce a remarkable new department in the volume for the coming year—an innovation which, with a difference, takes us back to the days of *Graham's Magazine* and *God's Lady's Book*. Each number will contain original music by eminent composers, such as J. K. Paine, Dudley Buck, Francis Boott, Julius Eichberg, George L. Osgood, etc.—Goethe's 'West-Eastern Divan,' translated, with an introduction and notes, by the Rev. John Weiss, is in the press of Roberts Bros.—'The Barton Experiment,' by Mr. John Habberton, author of 'Helen's Babies'; and 'The Scripture Club of Village Rest,' by an anonymous writer, are announced by G. P. Putnam's Sons. —A number of librarians (among whom the Redwood Library at Newport happens to be unrepresented, we observe) have drawn up a petition to Congress urging the passage of Senator Anthony's resolution for the purchase of the papers of Count Rochambeau, as an addition to our national archives. If this be done, as we hope it may be, there will be time to examine them carefully and to print the more important before the centenary of his arrival on these shores.—The Spanish Academy has gratefully acknowledged to Mr. Charles Frederick Bradford, of Boston, the gift of an autographic copy of his 'Index to the Notes of Don Diego Clemencin in his Edition of Don Quixote.' We gave an account of this remarkable work in No. 448 of the *Nation*. The copying must have been emphatically a labor of love.—A great reputation is very keenly but dispassionately examined in an article on 'Müller's Rig-Veda and Commentary,' by Prof. W. D. Whitney, which appears in this month's *New Englander*.—The death is announced in France of M. Eugène Despois, one of the leading critics of Molière, of whose works in 'Les Grands Écrivains de la France,' the great and admirable enterprise of the Messrs. Hachette, he was the editor. Only three volumes of this edition, which bid fair to be for a long time the standard, have appeared; it will doubtless be completed by another hand. Two years ago M. Despois published 'Le Théâtre Français sous Louis XIV.,' the book by which he is best known, and which shed fresh light on many of the circumstances under which were produced the masterpieces of Corneille, Molière, and Racine.—Calmann Lévy announces for early publication the third and final volume of the 'Théâtre Complet' of Ponsard, uniform with the first two volumes, which appeared four years ago.—One hundred copies of a translation of Poe's 'Bells,' by M. Blémond, with four etchings by M. Guérard, have just been published in Paris.

—In the *Nation* of Sept. 21 we said: "We last week received a letter from the head of one of the oldest and most respectable mercantile houses in New York, entirely approving of Mr. Tilden's decision to make no return of his income during the later years of the tax and suffer the penalty, or, at all events, treating it as a blameless or colorless act. By the same mail we received from Mr. Albert Small, of Maryland, also an honorable man, a letter in which he compared it to murder committed by a person who has made up his mind to gratify his hate and bear the prescribed punishment." Mr. Small thinks this reproduction of his remark did him injustice, and therefore, in compliance with his request, and in order that our readers may judge for themselves, we subjoin the passage in Mr. Small's letter on which our comments were based:

"Further, as to the income-tax charge, you say, page 142, 'because the law left him the alternative.' Is a murderer any the less criminal because, with the punishment of death before him as a penalty for murder, he chooses to submit himself to that penalty, for the gratification of his purpose in killing his enemy? Can a man of thoroughly honest and upright purposes make such a deliberate choice?"

—In our reference to the Law School of Harvard University last week we omitted to mention, as we might have done, that the first law school to require an entrance examination was that of Columbia College in this

city, which was also years ago the first to institute the final examination for the degree. The full effect which the entrance examination, first held this year, has had upon the numbers in attendance at the school can hardly be seen as yet, but a few of the statistics are suggestive. In 1860 the school graduated 27 students; in 1875 the number had steadily risen to 210, of whom 105, or exactly half, were college graduates or had received a degree equal to A.B. Of the 251 students who were graduated last May 119 had a previous degree, and so had 121 of the 322 members of the present senior class. But (and here the effect of the entrance examination first becomes evident) the new junior class numbers only 208, of whom 134, or about two-thirds, are college graduates. A falling off of 114 in the total number, accompanied by an increase of 13 in the number of those holding previous degrees, is obviously the result of the new requirements. The number of non-graduates entering the law school last year was 201; this year it is only 74. The decrease will hardly be so marked another year, as many intending students were ignorant of the new requirements and are now devoting the next twelve months to preparation. One query suggests itself: The law schools of Harvard, Yale, and Columbia can now or next year only be entered after examination—how long will it be before the medical schools will find themselves all compelled to follow in their footsteps?

—The November number of *Scribner's* is very much like any other number in most respects; and much like a number of any other magazine, except for the illustrations, in which it follows in the wake of *Harper's* most closely. Illustrations seem after all to be the great key to the success of a popular publication of this sort, and, the illustrations being given, it appears to make little difference of what material the text is composed. In the present number we have as the first article an elaborate description of the "Charter Oak City"—or, in other words, Hartford—with pictures not merely of the new capitol, Bushnell Park, Mrs. Colt's house (those who have studied with interest the origin and development of the "seminal pistol idea" will recognize some of the pictures as taken from the *Celt Memorial Volume*), the Charter Oak, Gravestones in the Cemetery, Dr. Horace Bushnell, Yung Wing, the Chinese educational commissioner, General Hawley, the residence of Mark Twain, and the Insane Asylum and the Deaf and Dumb Asylum, but even of the prominent insurance buildings, with the names of the companies in detail. Such articles as this have been now for a long time familiar to all readers of illustrated magazines, and, if we are not mistaken, are a product of American ingenuity. *A priori* it is difficult to see why any one should care much for a picture of the "Conn. Mutual Life building, containing also Phoenix Mutual Life Ins. Co.," or indeed nine-tenths of such views as can be found in the streets of Hartford, or any other square built American city; in fact, these articles seem to be brought out without much attempt to humor the love of the picturesque, Chicago or Milwaukee serving the publishers' turn quite as well as, or rather better than, Providence or Newburyport. The feeling to which they appeal in many cases is perhaps that half commercial patriotism and local pride which is rather American than English, and is not based so much on memories, traditions, and historical and family associations, as it is upon the prosperous feeling of solidarity in a community in which each individual hopes and expects to be richer ten years hence than he is now, counts the increase of population with a sense of personal aggrandisement, and keeps meanwhile a jealous eye upon the growth of rival communities. This local pride is fed in many ways—by population, by increasing clearing-house returns, even by the erection of inebriate asylums, by the possession of local, or, still better, non-local celebrities; and to see them all down not only on the printed but even on the illustrated page gives a gentle titillation to a most universal sentiment—the same sentiment which leads the newspapers of a Western growing town to devote so many of their columns to exposures of the hollowness of the "claims" put forward by rival sheets in rival towns, and the same feeling which, on a broader scale, leads hundreds of thousands of people to swell the crowd at Philadelphia on a day set apart for Ohio, to offset the crowd poured in for the honor and glory of Pennsylvania. The market created by this feeling in America is probably much larger than that in any other country; at least, we do not remember now any evidence that publishers have discovered it in other countries; such magazines as *Scribner's* or *Harper's* exist nowhere in the English-speaking world outside of the United States. In other respects there is a sameness in magazine literature, arising from the fact that the contributions come in a great measure from the same people (we find, for instance, in the current *Scribner's* the names of E. E. Hale, G. P. Lathrop, T. B. Aldrich, and J. T. McKay, all of whom we should have hardly expected to find together so far from New England), and partly from the fact that all magazines now keep what we have heard called, in

irreverent allusion to a profession not closely allied to literature, "end men," who, in style and general treatment of the topics they discuss, much resemble each other.

—The influence of the American climate on man and nature receives some valuable discussion in the *American Naturalist* for October. This subject appears to be engaging the attention of Prof. J. D. Whitney, whose article in a previous number, "Are We Drying Up?" we have already noticed. Under the head of "Plain, Prairie, and Forest" he undertakes first to lay down the distinction between plain and prairie (in American usage), showing that the latter does not shade off into the former—it is not "the incipient plain," but is "a heavily-grassed area, destitute of forest growth, but existing in the midst of a wooded region, where the climatological conditions are favorable to the growth of timber, but where some other cause than the want of sufficient moisture has operated to prevent this growth." Dismissing summarily the view held by many that the prairies exist because the trees have been burnt off at some remote period, he next considers the more respectable theory that the absence of trees is due to exceptional conditions of temperature, wind, or moisture. All these factors, however, examined in detail, fail to establish any local peculiarity, and Prof. Whitney reserves for a second paper his own view of the real cause that produces the prairie. The question of climate comes up incidentally but in a very interesting way, a few pages later, in Mr. S. H. Scudder's article on "A Cosmopolitan Butterfly" (*Vaneus cardui*). This butterfly is double-brooded in New England, while in Europe it is single-brooded; but this is only an illustration of a somewhat general law. While many species have more broods in the New World than in the Old, the reverse is never the case. The fact that "our summers are longer and hotter, and enjoy a marked preponderance of sunshine as compared with European summers," seems to Mr. Scudder to be sufficient of itself to explain the variation in the number of broods. Our butterflies do but furnish, he says, another instance of that intensity which seems to characterize all life in America:

"The expenditure of nervous and vital energy, against which physicians vainly inveigh, which superannuates our merchants, lawyers, clergymen, and other professional men, is not induced by the simple passion for gain, place, power, or knowledge, but by an uncontrollable restlessness, a constant dissatisfaction with present attainments, which marks us as a hurrying, energetic, enterprising people. My own experience has been that studies of precisely the same nature and undertaken under similar external conditions are accompanied by a very different mental state on the two continents. In Europe we are content to plod industriously on, unconscious of the need of relaxation; in America we bend with nervous intensity to our work, and carry the same excitement into the relaxation which such life inevitably demands. After a long absence in Europe, a keen observer may even be directly conscious of this quickened life."

Mr. Scudder inclines, of course, to account for these differences in man, as for the differences in butterflies, by the climatic peculiarities of the United States. But he suggests as an obstacle to this conclusion that whereas we may expect to find in Eastern Asia (whose extremes of temperature, humidity, rainfall, etc., are closely parallel with those of the Eastern United States) double and triple-brooded butterflies which are single-brooded in Europe, we can hardly imagine a greater contrast than that existing between the national character of the Chinese and that of the Americans.

—The age of German professors has been statistically examined at intervals of five years, beginning with 1870, by Dr. Etienne Laspeyres, of the University of Giessen. The latest result is given in Part 74 of Holtzendorff and Oncken's "Deutsche Zeit- und Streit-Fragen" (Berlin: Carl Habel; New York: L. W. Schmidt). In 1870-1, the writer's calculations were based on the ascertained age of 997 ordinary professors; in 1875-6, of 1,056. In the first case the average age proved to be 52.9 years; in the second, 52.8, or almost exactly the same. Regarding the separate faculties, it appeared that the professors of theology were the oldest at both periods (54 and 55 years respectively); that the professors of philosophy came next, having the average age of the whole; and that the professors of medicine (50.8 and 51.9) and of law (52.9 and 51.4) were the youngest. While theology had but 10.3 and 12.3 per cent. of its professors under 40, medicine had no less than 20.1 and 29.8; that is, medical students attain the professorship earlier than do the theological. On the other hand, 31 and 36.2 per cent. of the theological professors were over 60 years of age, but only 21.2 and 25.8 of the medical. It is suggested that the medical chairs are vacated earlier either in consequence of a higher death-rate arising from the practice of their incumbents, or because their incomparably better remuneration enables them to retire voluntarily. Professors of philosophy under forty numbered 16.4 and 19.2 per cent.; of law, 11.8 and 21.2. The accession of younger jurists coincides

with a decrease in those over 60, viz., from 29.6 to 26.6 per cent., whereas in the three other faculties those over 60 have increased. Dr. Laspeyres proceeds to show that the universities in which the average age of the professors is greatest have decidedly the largest attendance of students. He divides thirty universities into two groups of fifteen each, according to the attendance in 1875, and finds that the fifteen most frequented number 19,019 students against 5,191 in the second group (=300:100), and that the professors average 53.5 years in the first case and 51.5 in the last. Without exception all the faculties in the elder group were best attended—theology =221:100; law=641:100; medicine, 274:100; and philosophy, 366:100. The preponderance in the elder law faculties is very striking. The ten Prussian universities give similar results, confirming the alleged relation between attendance and professorial age. Dr. Laspeyres, having thus cleared the way, proceeds to discuss a question of university policy: at what age a professor should be relieved of a part of his duties by a colleague or wholly retired. We cannot follow him further than to remark that he estimates the cost of a compulsory rejuvenation of professorships whose incumbents have reached seventy at 200,000 thalers (600,000 marks) per annum—a sum so large in German official eyes that he has to apologize for proposing such an outlay by showing that the benefits arising from the renewal would be well worth the cost.

—The monument to Henri Regnault, the young French painter, of a promise so exceptionally brilliant, who was killed in January, 1871, during a sally from besieged Paris, has been completed. Erected by subscription among the pupils and ex-pupils of the Ecole des Beaux Arts, the monument stands in the cloister of the inner court of that institution—the charming "Cour du Murier." The court is like a glimpse of Florence or Rome, with its graceful arcades and its great mulberry-tree and picturesque fountain in the centre. Under the arcade, near one of its angles, rises the singular structure which the taste of the authorities concerned has deemed most fitting to commemorate the genius and premature death of the author of the "Salome" and the portrait of General Prim. It consists of two columns and a pediment, in white marble, with a high pedestal surmounted by a bust in bronze enclosed within them. Against the pedestal leans the figure of "La Jeunesse," by M. Chapu, which attracted such admiration in the Salon of 1875; the bust which crowns it is a head of Regnault, and is from the hand of M. Degeorge. The columns, the arch above them, and all the available space between them, are covered with gilding—symbolic flowers and vines and arabesques; and directly behind the bust is an elaborate and brilliant mosaic. On the columns are graven in gold the names of the other pupils of the school who fell in the late war, with their professions and the dates of their death. Their names are nine in number, and five out of the nine are architects. Of the remainder, two are painters and two sculptors. The monument is overcharged with gilding and is entirely deficient in simplicity, and the result is a regrettable lack of impressiveness. Its designers have wished to avoid what are called in France the "banal" and the "convenu," but they have fallen, on the other hand, into something which may be almost termed the tawdry. M. Degeorge has done but meagre justice to Regnault's handsome and intellectual head; the face looks morbid and truculent, and the bronze is so dark in tone that it may be almost mistaken for that inexpressive material, black basalt. The redeeming feature in the work is the extremely beautiful figure of M. Chapu, which is, however, of so delicate and refined a quality that it is rather lost in the garishness of what surrounds it. It represents a very young girl, with her back turned and her head thrown back, pressing against a wall, and stretching up a lovely virginal arm to hang a wreath of laurel against the base of the bust. One of her knees is lifted against a projecting ledge, and her right hand is also raised, with a gesture admirably rendered, to assist her movement. The position was full of difficulties for the sculptor, which have been most skilfully, and yet most naturally, dealt with; and the figure is instinct with youth, eagerness, slenderness, lightness, and the charming quality for which the Latins had the charming word *gracilis*. It must be added, however, that in its actual situation it regrettably suggests a sugar-image wrapped in gilt paper, or even one of the effigies of the Christ-child at the foot of a Christmas-tree. Regnault's most eloquent monument is still his superb portrait of Prim at the Luxembourg.

—The twelfth (in reality fourteenth) volume of the gigantic history of the drama by Klein, whose death we noticed in a late issue, has recently appeared, being the first volume of the history of the English drama ("Geschichte des Dramas." Leipzig: T. O. Weigel. 1876). The seven hundred and fifty-four large octavo pages of this volume carry us no further than the Chester, Towneley, and Coventry plays, but, on the other hand, they

give us a detailed description of Great Britain's physical geography and original inhabitants which fills fifty-eight pages, and eighty-five more are necessary to take us through the Anglo-Saxon conquest. It is true that a nation's dramatic spirit is manifested in its popular songs, but that is no reason why forty-eight pages of the work before us should be devoted to a bibliography of the Scottish ballads. It has been well said that Klein suffered from bad literary digestion, and his great work is a huge mass of ill-digested materials of comparatively little use to any one. It is, moreover, disfigured by a style the like of which, it is safe to say, has never been seen before in this century, and interrupted by outbursts of rage against his critics or those with whom he differs. Those who wish to see the capabilities of the German language for abuse should read the author's attack on Paul Heyse, p. 591, and on Ebert, p. 731; the former's fault consisting in having written the novel 'Kinder der Welt,' the latter's in having given an analysis of the Towneley mysteries in which he did not deem it necessary to translate literally the improprieties of the original.

RECENT POLITICAL BIOGRAPHY.*

THE campaign life of Mr. Hayes, written by Mr. Howells, differs considerably from that brought out by Mr. Howard. The first is, as the author informs the public in his preface, "his own enterprise," and "in nowise adopted or patronized" by Mr. Hayes. The second has been prepared "under the special sanction of Governor Hayes by a biographer of his own selection, to whom he has afforded every facility for the production of a correct and reliable narrative." The latter contains more in the way of speeches and messages. The former has literary merits which the latter lacks. To write a campaign life, as Mr. Howard understands it, is a much simpler undertaking than to write one for the audience to which Mr. Howells evidently appeals. One is prepared for the People, or perhaps, more accurately, for "the boys" who lead, arouse, and exhort the People; the other for a more select audience, who, without being over-fastidious or aristocratic or cold-blooded in their tastes, are too well educated not to be repelled by grossly exaggerated eulogy. Mr. Howard has accordingly no hesitation in declaring that "in the interest of learning, higher education, human benevolence, and equal rights, Hayes has accomplished more than any governor of Ohio has yet had" (*sic*); adds that "his integrity is a proverb," that "his record is of unassailable soundness," and that in his character "there is absolutely nothing vulnerable." The outline of his life given by Mr. Howard is substantially the same, of course, as that given by Mr. Howells, and we turn from the former's "specially-sanctioned" paragon to find relief in the latter's picture of the man himself. It is in most respects a pleasing picture of an honest, simple-minded, modest citizen, a good soldier, a faithful and energetic lawyer, and a public-spirited politician—we use the word without any bad meaning. No doubt a great deal of Governor Hayes's popularity in Ohio comes from his gallant services in the war, in which he showed great courage and willingness to expose himself to danger, combined with a caution as to doing it needlessly that reads more like the behavior of a veteran than of a volunteer. He had four horses shot under him and received four wounds in action, facts which really prove more than the additional circumstance that he was "under fire a hundred times," the phrase "under fire" being too elastic to have much meaning. In politics, however, he has given no evidence of a combative disposition, or at least none is given in the lives before us; he seems, on the contrary, to have no enemies, his temper apparently being very even and his disposition amiable. That he is "sound" on the questions of money and the civil service everybody is aware, though it is not perhaps known generally that while governor of Ohio he recommended the abolition of rotation in the State service.

The anonymous life of Mr. Wheeler, contained in the same volume with Mr. Howells's life of Mr. Hayes, is brief and uninteresting. It goes into few details, and contents itself with showing in some thirty pages that Mr. Wheeler has those qualities which go to make up a "representative man," which, for the sake of our common country, we are glad to say are consummate wisdom, ripe experience, strong religious feeling, unsullied purity, unspotted integrity, and matchless valor.

* 'Sketch of the Life and Character of Rutherford B. Hayes. By William D. Howells. Also a biographical sketch of William A. Wheeler.' With portraits of both candidates. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1876.

'The Life, Public Services, and Select Speeches of Rutherford B. Hayes. By J. Q. Howard.' Cincinnati: Robert Clarke & Co. 1876.

'The Life and Public Services of Hon. Samuel J. Tilden, Democratic Nominee for President of the United States. To which is added a Sketch of the Life of Hon. Thomas A. Hendricks, Democratic Nominee for Vice-President. By Theodore P. Cook, of the *Utica Observer*.' With portraits on steel. New York: Appletons.

'A Sketch of the Life and Opinions of Mr. Peter Cooper. Compiled from original sources. By Prof. J. C. Zachos, Curator of the Cooper Union.' New York: Murray Hill Publishing Co.

'The Life of James W. Grimes, Governor of Iowa, 1854-1858; a Senator of the United States, 1859-1869. By William Salter.' New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1876.

The "campaign life" is a peculiar production of American institutions, from which, no doubt, the philosophic student of social progress may derive interesting lessons. There is something to us slightly distasteful in it, and its existence throws some light upon the origin of the repugnance so many good citizens feel to public life. Naturally, every one enjoys the prospect of being able to take part in the work of government, but every one by no means enjoys the process of having every detail of his life, character, personal appearance, and habits collected and published to feed from a hundred printing-presses an ignorant or malicious public curiosity. To a certain amount of this kind of exposure every candidate must submit; but most of all the Presidential candidate. "—has reached the age of fifty-four, is five feet nine inches in height, and weighs one hundred and eighty pounds. Perfect health and habits leave him just in the ripe maturity of physical manhood and mind. His shoulders and breast are broad, his frame solid and compact, his limbs muscular and strong." This description only needs the usual measurement round the chest and the waistband to bring before the mind's eye a vivid picture of a retired rowing man or member of the P. R., whereas it is taken from Mr. J. Q. Howard's glowing pages, and is put forward as especially authorized information as to what we may call the "condition" of the Republican candidate for President.

Turning to the campaign lives of the Democratic candidates, we are struck with the confidence which their compilers show in the patience and strength of political appetite of the voting public. Mr. Cook's bulky volume contains matter enough for two or three campaigns, and in its elaboration cannot but remind the reader of the public documents put out by Mr. Tilden himself, the length of which the Republicans are in the habit, we believe unwisely, of sneering at. Their length and elaboration are, we imagine, designed for the benefit of the "rural districts," in which, it must be remembered, the voter does not have his thinking done for him by newspapers, but arrives at his political conclusions for himself, after much wood-pile and store-box argumentation. The main incidents of Mr. Tilden's career are so well known that it is hardly necessary to go into the details here presented. The reader will probably be surprised to find no reference whatever to his various perjuries, frauds, railroad swindles, and counterfeiting enterprises. The absence of these is, however, supplied to a certain extent in Mr. Howells's life of Hayes, in a number of passages in which, after describing some achievement of his favorite, the author expresses a desire to be told what the great reformer Samuel J. Tilden was doing about this time—a question implying the answer that he was really engaged in a dark and desperate plot to overthrow the liberties of his country, or in other equally nefarious machinations. The life of Mr. Hendricks presents few interesting features. His public career has been principally passed in the work of an Opposition leader through and since the war, work which has been neither very agreeable nor remarkable. But, with regard to both Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Hendricks, it should be said in fairness that they suffer in order that their respective chiefs may be strong. It would never do to let a campaign life of a candidate for the Vice-Presidency eclipse that of the head of the ticket, and therefore Mr. Hendricks and Mr. Wheeler get a page where Mr. Tilden and Mr. Hayes get ten. Even the prattling infancy of the "child Samuel," as Mr. Cook fondly calls him, is dwelt upon with fondness, to the neglect of early passages in Mr. Hendricks's career foreshadowing future greatness, which, had he been the Presidential nominee, would have received a larger share of attention.

Mr. Cooper has had the singular good fortune, for a candidate in the present campaign, to have escaped calumny, though whether this has been owing to his age and venerable character, or to the improbability of his securing a sufficient number of electoral votes to defeat Mr. Hayes and Mr. Tilden, we are unable to say. For ourselves, on the strength of the record produced by Mr. Zachos, we have no hesitation in saying that Mr. Cooper has claims upon the gratitude and suffrages of his fellow-citizens which neither of his rivals has, and we can hardly imagine any citizen of a free country, whose reading had been restricted to this work, arising from its perusal with any other feeling than a firm resolve to cast his ballot next month for Cooper and Cary. We must refer the voter to the volume itself for the details of Mr. Cooper's life. He will there find how much the school system, and the Fire Department, the efforts for the prevention of pauperism and for the preservation of the purity of elections, to say nothing of art, literature, and science, owe to Mr. Cooper. The only flaw which we can find in the record here presented is in the un-American name of the biographer, Mr. Zachos; but we are inclined, on the whole, to think this a point that in the long run will tell in favor of the Cooper ticket, as it sets at rest any suspicions that may exist as to Mr. Cooper's desire to put "none but Americans on guard" in the Treasury and the Post-Office. In

any event, we have no doubt that it can and will be satisfactorily explained.

The life of Mr. Grimes is that of a plain, straightforward public man, belonging to what may be called the last generation of politics—that is, to the generation before that in which civil-service reform, and the currency question, and “*Casualism*” were the prominent topics of the day, and before “charges” and “vindictions,” and indictments, prosecutions, convictions, imprisonment, and acquittals had come into use as ordinary everyday political machinery, and when the fear of the grand jury had as yet not made the friendship of the district attorney the first necessity of statesmanship. He lived, however, down to these latter days, and, towards the close of a blameless life, was obliged to endure, at the time of the impeachment of Andrew Johnson, a storm of denunciation and abuse which, to a man of any sensibility, must have been peculiarly distressing. He stood to his post manfully, however, and will no doubt some of these days be remembered as one of a small body of courageous men who saved the country from establishing a precedent which would have struck at the very roots of popular government. The life before us throws some light on a controversy now seven years old with regard to Mr. Sumner’s singular treatment of the Johnson-Clarendon treaty. We said in the *Nation*, after Mr. Sumner’s great speech on the *Alabama* claims, that in the fall of 1868, when Mr. Reverdy Johnson was going to England, Mr. Sumner had written a long letter to John Bright speaking of Mr. Johnson in the highest terms, calling attention to his unanimous confirmation by the Senate, and assuring Mr. Bright that he had the confidence and esteem of all parties, was abundantly competent to settle the *Alabama* question, and would, in his (Mr. Sumner’s) opinion, settle it; that after the treaty arrived here, Mr. Sumner, on the 17th of January, 1869, wrote to Mr. Bright commending it, and on the 19th, after dining with Grant, added a postscript with even a stronger recommendation, thus giving the British Cabinet the highest authority for believing that the Foreign Affairs Committee of the Senate wished Mr. Johnson to be implicitly trusted by the British Government. Mr. Sumner, in May, 1869, in an interview with a *Herald* correspondent, notwithstanding all this, laid it down that the British Cabinet ought not to have negotiated with the ambassador of a retiring administration, and added that “he thought once or twice of calling Mr. Thornton’s attention to this, but came to the conclusion that he had no right to do it.” The writing of the letters (which made Mr. Sumner’s great speech almost an international outrage) his friends at the time tried to deny, but they are now vouched for in the volume before us. In a letter to Mr. Fessenden from London, dated May 10, 1869 (at the time of the excitement created by Mr. Sumner’s speech), Mr. Grimes says:

“Mr. Bright told me to day that Johnson brought to him a letter of introduction from Sumner, endorsing him and what he might do in the strongest possible manner. . . . And he offered to show me a letter from Sumner to him, received about three weeks ago, in which he said that if the treaty had been submitted to the Senate twelve months ago, it would have passed that body with no dissentients.”

Again, in a letter from Paris to Mr. Henry W. Starr, dated July 23, he asks:

“Would you believe it possible that John Bright could have a letter from Sumner, written as late as January last, in which he said that had the *Alabama* Treaty been presented to the Senate one year ago it would have been confirmed without a dissenting voice? Yet it is true, for I have seen the letter; and yet Sumner made that speech.”

OUR PATENT SYSTEM.*

THE little manual whose title we give below will be chiefly useful to lawyers, and especially to those members of the profession who dislike and avoid patent practice, but are nevertheless occasionally called upon to consider patent questions; to solicitors of patents who desire to do good work; and to inventors and patentees who have had the advantage of preliminary intellectual training. The book is largely made up of citations from the leading decisions of the courts, arranged under their appropriate heads, and connected by explanatory remarks. Its most creditable feature is a compendious and judiciously arranged subject-matter index. We improve the opportunity afforded us by this publication to offer some remarks on the system to which it relates.

The distinguishing feature of the American Patent-Office is its enormous collection of models. The peculiarity of the system formerly consisted in rigid examinations, to test the novelty and usefulness of the inventions

sought to be patented. The collection of models was deemed so important that at first the models of rejected applications were permanently preserved. A few years ago, however, the Patent-Office museum became so crowded that to make room for models of patented cases the larger portion of the collection of rejected models was destroyed, or scattered about the country among various scientific institutions, where house-room could be found for them. Formerly new applications were tested by comparison with rejected cases. Now an examiner may not reject a new application upon reference to a rejected case, even though he knows beyond all question that the rejected application was for precisely the same invention as that described in the new application. It follows that patents are granted now for inventions which have been refused a patent in years gone by. The policy of the Patent-Office is changed, and some of the restrictions against the granting of patents, formerly maintained, no longer exist. The standard of requirement has been lowered, and the distinction between the results of invention on the one hand, and the exercise of mere mechanical skill on the other, has been, to some extent at least, lost sight of. It is not uncommon for old-established manufacturers to find that, in employing what they have perhaps properly considered mere mechanical skill in making the little changes in their machinery which have from time to time occurred to them, they have unwittingly infringed upon a patent or patents which they have never heard of, and it thus happens that manufacturers are assailed with charges of infringement upon newly-granted patents for devices which they have had in constant use for many years, and which they have never considered patentable inventions.

The modern policy of the Office is to strain every consideration in favor of the applicant—to give him a patent if possible. With nearly 200,000 patents in existence, the exhaustive determination of the question of novelty in every new application often involves a laborious and tedious search. It is not to be wondered at that an examiner is glad to find any colorable ground upon which to base a patent claim. Moreover, many of the employees of the Patent-Office hold their position by political influence. The pay is small, and the tenure of office uncertain. First-class men have not sufficient inducement to remain in the Office after they have become educated to their duties, and hence the work of examination is frequently committed to inexperienced men. As the result of all these causes, the number of patents is increasing at the rate of three hundred a week.

Necessarily, it appears from this, in the granting of patents the public rights are frequently overlooked. The public has a right to all inventions shown and described in expired patents, and to all inventions which have been publicly known and used for a period of two years without being patented. The exhibition of the rejected models in the Patent-Office museum was formerly held to be a sufficient publication of the invention to make it known to the public. The exhibition of models in patented cases is still so considered. Thus, a device shown in a model, but neither described in the specification nor shown in the drawings, is held to be a part of the invention, and if novel may be subsequently described and claimed in a *résumé* of the patent. As the public succeeds to the rights of the patentee when the term of the patent expires, it follows that the public has an indisputable right to all inventions or devices shown in the models of expired patents, even though they are not shown in the drawings or described in the specifications of those patents. A model, again, not only contains the patented invention, but frequently exhibits the prior state of the art, by showing the machine or object upon which the patented improvement is placed. Unpatented structures in common use are rarely described with the elaboration and detail of a patent specification, and it has often happened that the undescribed devices contained in old models have proved complete defenses against loosely-granted modern patents.

It has been suggested that models be dispensed with in all cases, and it has been said that we should thus get rid of an aggregation of rubbish. The public rights, already injured by the destruction and scattering of rejected models, would be still further imperilled by adopting this suggestion. It has also been proposed that models should be required or permitted only in cases of singular merit or novelty exhibiting decided advances in the arts to which the inventions relate. But the public cannot afford to lose the protection it derives from the preservation of models. Meritorious inventors cannot afford to entrust to the already overworked officials of the Patent-Office the power of selecting models for preservation. In the exercise of such power, with the best intentions, there would be a constant liability to error in judgment, because at first radically new inventions are frequently unappreciated, and perhaps even misapprehended, not only by the officials of the Patent-Office, but by the solicitors who draw the specifications. Inventive genius is not always accompanied with the power of lucid description, and faults of omission may lie against the

* Treatise on United States Patents, for Inventors and Patentees. By H. and C. Howson. Philadelphia: Porter & Coates. 1876.

door of the inventor who fails to instruct his agent thoroughly, as well as against the agent who fails in drawing the specification to describe all the elements of the invention. By our system the model deposited in the Patent-Office becomes a part of the record, and affords the best security to the rights of the inventor, because the model may form the basis for a re-issue in which the omissions and defects of the original patent may be corrected.

Our American patent system is probably in danger of toppling over of its own weight. It is becoming unpopular from the vexation it inflicts upon manufacturing interests. As far as mere dollars and cents are concerned, it is often cheaper for a manufacturer to submit to blackmail for an alleged infringement than to go to the expense of defending a lawsuit, even although he knows that his defence will be perfect, and that the suit must result in a decision that the patent is invalid. If it be desired to stay the tide of growing feeling against our Patent-Office there must be a reform in its methods—a return to somewhat of the ancient strictness of requirement, which limited the grant of patents to absolutely novel and useful inventions. There can be no such reform unless the office is relieved from the dominion of politics, and sufficiently large salaries are paid to retain the services of skilled examiners to act as judges upon new applications. It has been ingeniously suggested that applicants shall be permitted to insert any claims they choose in their patents upon condition that there shall be printed or endorsed upon the patent a list of prior patents which, in the opinion of the Patent-Office, exhibit the same or a similar invention. The effect of such endorsement would not be to relieve the courts from considering the question of patentability, and the objection would still be that the expense to a manufacturer of protecting himself against an invalid patent would be greater than the payment of a sum of money to the patentee as a consideration for being let alone.

An Historical Account of the Old State House of Pennsylvania, now known as the Hall of Independence. By Frank M. Etting. (Boston: J. R. Osgood & Co. 1876.)—This monograph is not more a history of a famous building than it is of Pennsylvania before and during and immediately after the Revolution. State and national memories cluster equally about the old State House, and we have found Mr. Etting's account of the doings of the Assembly as entertaining as anything he reports of the sessions of the Second Continental Congress or the Federal Convention to frame the Constitution. Most curious is the chapter on the conflicts between this Quaker body and the colonial governors on the subject of military supplies and protection of the inhabitants against savage inroads:

"The peaceable principles professed by a majority of the Assembly were assigned as early as 1745 for not permitting them to join in raising men or providing arms and ammunition. 'Yet,' say they, in a communication to Governor Thomas, 'we have ever held it our duty to render tribute to Caesar,' and hence they notified him of a resolution for 'appropriating £4,000 to the King's use, to be expended in the purchase of bread, beef, pork, flour, wheat, or other grain, and to be shipped for the King's service, as the Governor shall think most fit.' The Governor, at first indignant, seems to have received an intimation subsequently that 'other grain' could be construed into *gunpowder*, which Franklin tells us was accordingly bought, and the Assembly never objected to it."

Another interesting incident in State politics which Mr. Etting records is the appointment, under the Pennsylvania constitution of 1776, of a Council of Censors, which met for the first and only time in November, 1783. This singular body was to examine whether in the previous seven years the Constitution had been violated in any respect, and, if it seemed advisable, to call a convention for revising the instrument. The Council, after a year's deliberation, came to the conclusion that infringements had occurred and that revision was necessary, pointing out among other desirable changes that "the judiciary, supreme as well as subordinate, should be appointed by the Governor, during good behavior." But, as is well known, this recommendation was not followed, and the judges are to-day, says our author, "dependent from first to last upon the dregs of the people, irresponsible except to the ward politician."

Everything that can now be learned about the building of the State House, its changes in extent and its various uses, Mr. Etting has gathered with the greatest diligence, and luminously arranged in this volume. He corrects tradition as to the architect, giving the credit of its design and supervision to Andrew Hamilton, Speaker of the Assembly; he relates the history of the Bell, whose inscription, by the way—"Proclaim Liberty throughout all the land"—appears to have been suggested, prophetically, by another Speaker, Isaac Norris. The Bell was originally made in England, but cracked soon after its arrival, was thereupon broken up and recast here by Pass and Stow, and still a third time had to go to the pot

before it was acceptable. The restoration of Independence Hall, with which Mr. Etting is so honorably identified as a leading spirit, is fully described, and here, as throughout the work, the aid of the camera is invoked to reproduce the scenes and objects alluded to. There is, indeed—and this is rare praise—not a single superfluous or worthless illustration, out of a large number, in the whole volume. They are either fac-similes of old prints, documents, and autographs, or views from nature, or copies of paintings, and in them all the heliotype process is seen at its best. The volume is elegantly printed and bound, and we have seen nothing to compare with it among all the memorial publications of the Centennial Year.

English History in the Fourteenth Century. By Charles H. Pearson, late Fellow of Oriel College. (London: Rivingtons. 1876. 12mo, pp. 332.)—Another volume has been added to Mr. Oscar Browning's series of Historical Hand-books, a history of England in the fourteenth century, by Mr. Pearson, author of the well-known History of Mediæval England. The somewhat artificial limits of a calendar century are construed liberally, but not with entire consistency—the Scottish history beginning with the death of Alexander III., 1286, while English events are taken up at the accession of Edward II., 1307. As the close of the century happens to coincide almost exactly with a change of dynasty, the limit at this end is perhaps as good as need be. Mr. Pearson possesses in a high degree the distinctive merits of an historian. Besides the primary essential of an historical scholar, an accurate knowledge of facts, and the power of presenting the facts in an attractive and intelligible form, he has that historical sense, as we may call it, without which the most profound learning is mere antiquarianism and the most brilliant rhetoric nothing but tinsel. He is enabled by this to place himself in the midst of the events which he describes, and survey them at once from the point of view of their own narrow interests and from the broader outlook of the present day. There results an unusual freshness, both in material and in treatment, a constant deviation from the hackneyed path of historians to mention some novel fact or suggest some inference which will aid in the vividness of the picture. This freshness of treatment is shown, for example, in the character of the Black Prince. Mr. Pearson has succeeded, more than any writer with whom we are acquainted, in ridding himself of the glamour of false chivalry which has been thrown around this popular hero, whom he pronounces "of very vulgar mould."

"The pride of birth that made him side with Pedro the Cruel because his rival was a bastard; the pride of race that led him to treat his Gascon allies as inferiors, and persist in taxing a privileged community; and that worst pride of a vindictive mind which led him to order the murder of prisoners in cold blood at Poitiers and at Limoges, are the most distinct traits of a character that made him detested in Aquitaine, and would probably have provoked revolt in England had he ever come to the throne" (p. 20).

Richard II., too, is the subject of discriminating judgment:

"He was at this time [that of Wat Tyler's insurrection] a fair, yellow-haired, round-faced boy, with something of his mother's beauty, easily blushing, and speaking with a slight lisp. Events showed that he inherited the sumptuous tastes of his family and the fierceness of his father, the devotion to friends and general faithlessness of the second Edward, with a singular power of dissimulation and great tenacity of purpose. Under better circumstances Richard might have been a magnificent and glorious king. In Ireland, where he had almost absolute power, he showed himself able to understand the real wants of the country, and to legislate wisely for them" (p. 268). Again: "Very different from Edward II., whom he seems superficially to resemble, Richard II., in later years at least, was never governed by his favorites, but pursued a policy of his own with which they were not trusted, and which kept them in constant terror by its breadth, its thoroughness, and its secrecy. Could he have held his hands from his cousin's heritage, at least till that cousin was in his power, Richard would probably have succeeded in transforming the English monarchy after the French model."

We may be permitted to doubt, however, whether Richard would have succeeded where Henry VIII., Elizabeth, and Charles I. failed—in establishing a permanent despotism. English liberties had a bottom which French liberties never had.

The paucity of dates is a serious defect in this volume. For example, in the chapter upon Scotland, we find not a single date between the death of Alexander III. (1286) and that of Edward I. (1307). In chapter vi. we find some carelessness in proof-reading. It was not Languedoc but Dauphiné (p. 114) that included the cities of Grenoble, etc., and was outside of the boundaries of France. On the next page, the appeal should be to the French *courts*, not *counts*. We do not understand the expression (p. 117) "the dominion was very scantily peopled"; does it mean the so-called *domain*, or crown lands, of the kings of France? These lands we had sup-

posed to be rather populous. On page 118, who was the "heir to the crown of Bohemia"? Certainly not the King of Bohemia himself. We find Sir John Chandos twice called (pp. 192 and 226) "the greatest soldier of his time"; does not this honor belong rather to Du Guesclin? We find on page 51 a remark which, if possibly a little too sweeping in its assertion, does nevertheless present an important aspect of society, and one almost entirely lost sight of in the ordinary descriptions of this period:

"The English nobles of Edward's [I.] time were essentially country gentlemen, whose farms were ordered with minute precision, and who freely indulged their various tastes for agriculture or art."

There are some excellent remarks (p. 212) upon the effect of Edward's Scottish policy in checking a strong tendency towards assimilation between the two kingdoms and seriously crippling the English power:

"Scotland was now an active enemy, connected by the closest alliance with France. Not even during the short period when it was nominally subdued did it ever add to the strength or treasure of England; whenever England was threatened with foreign war it became necessary to watch the Scotch frontier, and at times the Scotch felt strong enough to challenge

their neighbor to war unsupported. . . . The difference of language and law, which proved so great a barrier to union in later centuries, dates from the English attempt to enforce suzerainty."

BOOKS OF THE WEEK.

| Authors.—Titles. | Publishers.—Prices. |
|--|---------------------|
| Allen (Prof. F. D.), The Modes of Euripides (Ginn Bros.) \$1 25 | |
| Baumgarten (Dr. M.), Das Kampf um das Reichsreligionsgesetz in der deutschen protestantischen Kirche, swd. (L. W. Schmidt) | |
| Puchholz (Dr. H.), Land und Leute in Westafrika, swd. (L. W. Schmidt) | |
| Clark (C.), Practical and Progressive Latin Grammar (Chas. Scribner & Sons) | 1 25 |
| Gifford (C. A.), Rules for a Printed Dictionary Catalogue, swd. (Washington) | |
| Freeman (E. A.), Historical and Architectural Sketches (Macmillan & Co.) | 3 00 |
| Garnier (C.), Le Nouvel Opéra de Paris, Part I., swd. (A. Lévy) | |
| Gibson (W. H.), The Complete American Trapper (James Miller) | |
| Globe Encyclopædia, Paris V., VI., swd. (Estes & Lauriat) | 50 |
| Janet et ses Adversaires (D. Appleton & Co.) | |
| Luspeyres (Dr. E.), Das Alter der deutschen Professoren, swd. (L. W. Schmidt) | |
| Mutual Criticism, swd. (Onida, N. Y.) | 25 |
| Newton (Rev. R. H.), The Morals of Trade (T. Whittaker) | 1 00 |
| Official Catalogue of the United States International Exhibition, revised ed. (J. E. Nagle & Co.) | 2 00 |
| Oosterzee (Prof. J. J. van), Christian Dogmatics, 2 vols. (Scribner, Armstrong & Co.) | |
| Payne (Prof. J.), Science and Art of Education (E. Setzler) | 40 |
| Rayn (J.), Fallen Fortunes: a Tale, swd. (D. Appleton & Co.) | 75 |
| Public Libraries of the U. S. A., swd. (Macmillan & Co.) | |
| Richardson (Dr. B. W.), Hygieia: a City of Health, swd. (Washington) | 30 |
| Schmidt (Dr. J.), Schiller und Rousseau, swd. (L. W. Schmidt) | |
| Schwimmer (Dr. E.), Die ersten Anfänge der Heilkunde im alten Aegypten, swd. (L. W. Schmidt) | |

JUST PUBLISHED.

I.

The Carlyle Anthology.

Selected and Arranged, with the author's sanction, by Edward Parrett. 12mo, \$2.

II.

The Milton Anthology.

Selected from the Prose Writings. 12mo, \$2.
(Formerly known as "Treasures from Milton's Prose.")

III.

Mr. Weeks's Posthumous Volume of Poems.

Twenty Poems.

By ROBERT KELLEY WEEKS. 16mo, \$1 50.

IV.

A new Novel in the Leisure-Hour Series.

Noblesse Oblige.

By the author of "Mlle Mori." 16mo, \$1 25.

"If all novels were as good as 'Noblesse Oblige,' reading them might become instructive, and reviewing them a pleasure. . . . It contains thoughtful writing and some really clever delineation of character. . . . The plot is certainly ingenious."—*Athenæum*.

V.

Gasc's French Dictionary.

8vo, \$1 50.

The Publishers feel secure in emphatically recommending this Dictionary, and invite detailed comparisons with similar works.

HENRY HOLT & CO., 25 Bond Street, New York.

JUST READY.

THE STORY OF OUR COUNTRY.

By Mrs. L. B. Monroe. Square 16mo, cloth, unique illustrated, \$1 50.

NEW BOOKS BY REV. M. J. SAVAGE.

THE RELIGION OF EVOLUTION.

12mo, cloth, \$1 50.

LIGHT ON THE CLOUD; or, Hints

of Comfort for Hours of Sorrow. 16mo, cloth, gilt, \$1 25.

READY SHORTLY.

STUDENT LIFE AT HARVARD.

Price \$1 50.

* * * At all bookstores, or sent by mail on receipt of price.

LOCKWOOD, BROOKS & CO., PUBLISHERS,

351 Washington Street.

BOOKS AT LONDON PRICES.

Now Ready: Catalogue No. 10 of Rare, Valuable, and Curious Books, free on application.

JOHN EVANS, Importer, 191 Fulton St., Brooklyn, N.Y.

A FULL STOCK OF

Books in Foreign Languages.

Subscriptions for Periodicals

SCHOENHOF & MOELLER, Importers and Publishers,
40 Winter Street, Boston.

Catalogues sent on application.

F. W. CHRISTERN,

FOREIGN BOOKSELLER AND IMPORTER,

77 UNIVERSITY PLACE, NEW YORK.

Large assortments of the publications of Charpentier, Didot, Didot, Hachette, Lévy, Presses, etc., on hand; also complete lists of Fauchard's Collection of British Authors, and Feulner's Greek and Roman Classics. All European periodicals received weekly in parcels.

Professional.

A. J. BLOOR, Architect, 128 Broadway, New York.

CHARLES FOLLEN McKIM, Architect, 51 Broadway, New York.

DETLEF LIENAU, Architect, Trinity Building, 111 Broadway, New York.

GAMBRILL & RICHARDSON, Architects, 51 Broadway, New York.

HENRY M. CONGDON, Architect, Trinity Building, 111 Broadway, New York.

JAMES R. WILLETT, Architect, No. 85 Dearborn Street, Chicago.

RICHARD M. UPJOHN, Architect, Trinity Building, 111 Broadway, New York.

RUSSELL STURGIS, Architect, 103 Fifth Ave., S. W. corner Sixteenth St., New York.

GEO. E. WARING, Jr., Consulting Engineer, for Sanitary and Agricultural Works, Newport, R. I.

JOHN C. RANDOLPH, A.M., E.M., Mining Engineer and Geologist recently in the service of the Japanese Government, 35 Broadway, New York.

F. WEIDENMANN, Landscape Gardener and Engineer, 110 Broadway, New York.

L. W. LEEDS, Engineer of Ventilation, 110 Broadway, New York.

D. P. FACKLER, Consulting Actuary for Life Insurance matters, 320 Broadway, New York.

ARTHUR v. BRIESEN, Solicitor of Patents, etc., 228 Broadway, New York.

FRANCIS A. GERLACH, Teacher of Singing and of the Piano, 6 E. 20th Street, between Broadway and Fifth Avenue.

ERNST PERABO, Teacher of the Piano, Boston, Mass.

Schools.

Alphabetized, first by States; second, by Towns; third, by Initial Letters of the Announcements.

Fifteen cents per printed line.

CONNECTICUT, Bridgeport.

GOLDEN HILL SEMINARY for Young Ladies, Bridgeport, Ct. Address Miss EMILY NELSON.

CONNECTICUT, Bridgeport.

HILLSIDE SEMINARY.—English, French, and Classical School for Young Ladies and Children. Preparation for college a specialty. Address ANNE J. STONE, CORNELIA KNOWLES, OF MARIANA B. SLADE.

CONNECTICUT, Granby.

ENGLISH and Classical Family School for Boys.—Rev. Nathaniel H. Eggleston, with competent assistance, takes charge of the education of a limited number of boys at his home in this pleasant and healthful village, on the line of the New Haven and Northampton Railroad.

CONNECTICUT, Hartford, 801 Asylum Avenue.

MISS HAINES FAMILY AND DAY School for Young Ladies and Misses, 801 Asylum Ave., Hartford, Ct. Number limited. Send for circular.

CONNECTICUT, New Britain.

NEW BRITAIN SEMINARY for Young Ladies. Address D. N. CAMP, Principal.

CONNECTICUT, New Haven.

GROVE HALL.—Miss Montfort's School for Young Ladies. Fall term begins September 29, 1876.

CONNECTICUT, New Haven.

SHEFFIELD SCIENTIFIC SCHOOL of Yale College.—Address PROF. G. J. BRUSH.

DELAWARE, Wilmington.

MISS ROBERTSON'S School for Girls. Number of pupils limited.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, Washington.

COLUMBIAN UNIVERSITY.—College, Law School, and Medical School. For catalogues, address J. C. WELLING, LL.D., President.

FRANCE, Neuilly, near Paris.

EDUCATION FOR YOUNG GENTLEMEN, 25 Rue de Château, near the Bois de Boulogne and Jardin d'Acclimatation. Greek, Latin, Mathematics, French, German; Park and Garden of 10,000 metres; complete Gymnasium. Family life. First-class references in Paris. Moderate terms. Address Dr. BICHOFER.

GERMANY, Hanover, 52 Grosse Barfüsser.

ACADEMY FOR YOUNG LADIES, conducted by Misses HILKEN and Von Lochhausen. Best references here and abroad.

For particulars and prospectus, Address H. G. HILKEN, Box 723, Baltimore, Md.

ILLINOIS, Chicago.

UNION COLLEGE OF LAW, of the two Universities. Henry Booth, LL.D., Dean. 8 Instructors, 23 Lecturers, 128 Students, and 50 Graduates the past (third) year. Terms \$50. Address V. B. DENLOW, LL.D., Sec'y.

IOWA, Iowa City.

LAW DEPARTMENT OF IOWA STATE University. Course of one or two years at option. Tuition \$50 per year. Address WM. G. HAMMOND.

MAINE, Augusta.

ST. CATHARINE'S HALL. Diocesan School for Girls. The Rev. SAMUEL UPJOHN, Rector. Address MATHIA E. DAVIS, Principal. Ninth year begins Wednesday, Sept. 13. Circulars sent on application.

Md., Emmittsburg.

MT. ST. MARY'S COLLEGE. Regular session begins Sept. 5, 1876. Students received at any time. Course embraces collegiate, preparatory, and junior departments, last named in a separate building. Arrangements have been made with the Sisters of Charity of Nazareth to take charge of the domestic department of the college. Send for catalogue.

Rev. JOHN McCLOSKEY, D.D., Principal.

MARYLAND, Baltimore, 197 and 199 N. Charles St.

SOUTHERN HOME SCHOOL for Girls. Estab. 1842. Mr. & Mrs. W. M. CARY; Mrs. Gen. PEGRAM.

MARYLAND, Ellicott City (near Baltimore).

ST. CLEMENT'S HALL. A thorough Boys' School. CHAS. A. DE M. SPENCER, Ph.D., Head Master.

MARYLAND, Govanstown, near Baltimore.

NOTRE DAME OF MARYLAND, a Collegiate Institute for Young Ladies. For particulars, send for catalogue.

